

TODAY'S SPEECH

NOVEMBER, 1955

50 Cents a Copy

\$1.50 a Year

Published Quarterly

Volume III - Number 4

The Formidable Imprints of Speech

by Dominick A. Barbara page 3

Getting The Most Out of Those Meetings

by Ernest W. Fair page 8

How to Make A Communication Survey

by Thomas R. Nilsen page 10

Teedyuscung, Speaker for the Delawares

by Frank W. Merritt page 14

What Do Students Care About Freedom of Speech?

by George B. Rice Jr. page 19

Public Speaking—Source and Force in History

by W. David Lewis page 22

Other Available Means of Persuasion

by J. Calvin Callaghan page 26

From the Discipline of Philosophy

by Clarence S. Angell page 26

From the Discipline of Social Psychology

by Ordean G. Ness page 29

From the Discipline of Literary Criticism

by Charles Daniel Smith page 33

Speech is Civilization - - Silence Isolates

★ Christmas Gifts ★ Christmas Gifts ★ Christmas Gifts ★

Christmas Gifts!

What can you give to the people on your list whom you want to remember with a gift that will be really meaningful—yet inexpensive?

What could you give that would mean more than a subscription to TODAY'S SPEECH? A gift that will renew itself four times a year a gift that will help them and inspire them in many ways a gift that proves you have their welfare at heart a gift that demonstrates your faith in their progress and personal achievement

We have lots of evidence of the enthusiasm of our readers. Our circulation is growing rapidly and if we had the means for massive promotion it would grow a great deal faster. Our best friends are our present readers. Won't you give thought to the people on your Christmas list who would be pleased to receive TODAY'S SPEECH? The January issue will reach them just about Christmas Day.

Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts

Please send TODAY'S SPEECH for one year to each of the following:
(your own renewal should be included!) — — —

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Enclosed is my check for _____ (at \$1.50 per subscription)

(Only \$1.25 per subscription if three or more are ordered together)

Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts Christmas Gifts

★ Christmas Gifts ★ Christmas Gifts ★ Christmas Gifts ★

The Formidable Imprints of Speech ♦ ♦ ♦

By Dominick A. Barbara, M.D.

Dr. Barbara, author of STUTTERING: A PSYCHODYNAMIC APPROACH TO ITS UNDERSTANDING AND TREATMENT, Julian Press, 1954, is a practicing psychoanalyst — formerly Supervising Psychiatrist with the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene.

Language is our prime means of communication. With the use of the spoken word we convey to others our individual opinions, thoughts, feelings and attitudes. Though great numbers of vertebrated species communicate by sound, to Man alone is definitely restricted the use of articulate speech. *Homo sapiens*, or Modern Man, as we generally refer to him, has conventionalized his vocal sounds to convey complex thoughts and meanings in a way no other animal does. From our present knowledge, we find that no animals below the level of man have true speech. Animals do vocalize and communicate by sound and bodily movements, but beyond this we have no evidence of any language ability. The human species has developed through the ages what no other animal has been endowed with, that is — "a speaking language".

I

In the evolution of man, speech is the most highly integrated function. It has served as one of the most direct means of expression toward establishing social contact. Man has been referred to as a symbol-making organism, and rightfully so, for without the capacity to speak we could hardly be human.

The difference between adult human thought and the mental reactions of a dog or monkey seems to be a difference not in kind but in complexity. Man has created and developed a new stage above these animal levels by the introduction of symbols and words — both of the spoken and written variety.

The greatest mental tool created by man is the symbol. Without it, it would be imperative for us to deal directly with things, instead of the more practical and simpler expression of our ideas and feelings through words. But, even aside from words, there were the much simpler primitive methods of communication and symbol expression in the form of gesture-language and picture-writing. The American Indians, for instance, who are expert in gesture and sign language, demonstrate vividly the simplicity and almost child-like clarity of their communicative tools. Our own everyday experience attests graphically to one use of sign-language and and symbolic gesture as a form of effective communication: the lively "conversation" carried on by deaf-mutes. (This points up the fact that in order for thoughts to be conveyed to the outside, we need at least one of the special senses of

Published by the Speech Association of the Eastern States

TODAY'S SPEECH. — Volume III, Number 4, — November, 1955

H. BARRETT DAVIS, PRESIDENT, SAES,

Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

PAUL D. HOLTZMAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, SAES,

Queens College, Flushing, New York

ROBERT T. OLIVER, EDITOR,

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

RALPH N. SCHMIDT, BUSINESS MANAGER,

Utica College, Utica, New York

CIRCULATION STAFF:— Mrs. Harriett Nesbitt, Alan L. McLeod and Mrs. Marion B. McLeod of Penn State; Lindsey S. Perkins, Brooklyn; Milton J. Wiksell, Indiana U.; Edward Shanken, New Hampshire U.; James Mullendore, U. of Virginia; Zelda H. Kosh, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS: Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell; Arthur Eisenstadt, Rutgers; Lindsey S. Perkins, Brooklyn

TODAY'S SPEECH is published quarterly, January, April, September, and November, by the Speech Association of the Eastern States. Subscriptions provided with membership in SAES: apply to the Executive Secretary. Subscriptions to non-members. \$1.50 yearly, by volume year only. Advertising rates on request. Entered as second class-matter at the post office at State College, Pa., under the act of March 3, 1897. Please send notice on Form 3587 and return copies under label Form 3597 to TODAY'S SPEECH, 300 Sparks Bldg., The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

hearing and seeing. Only in exceptional cases like that of Helen Keller can language be conveyed by touch.)

Language is the most effective means of expression of human thought. Man is the sole possessor of language and has used it from generation to generation. Language is specific to the particular individual using it and is in direct relationship to the culture or milieu in which he communicates at the time. It is also related to and dependent to some extent on the individual's early parental influences and training, his intellectual capacities and his experiences. Finally, to quote from Nolan D. C. Lewis, an authority in psychiatry, "Every language used by a people has its own characteristic framework of established distinctions, its shapes and forms of thought into which, for the one who learns that language as his 'native tongue', are cast the contents of his mind, his mass of acquired impressions, and his knowledge of the environment."

It would be difficult to erase the formidable imprints left upon us throughout history by the use of language. The force and magnitude of communicative language, for instance, is vividly exemplified in the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, and in the Gospel of the New Testament with their word-by-mouth teachings of Jesus to his disciples. In conveying to the people the commandments of Jehovah, the Hebrew prophets used a direct: "Thus saith the Lord." So powerful was the authority of the prophet among the Hebrew people that the King not infrequently trembled at his voice; for he was the direct instrument of transmission for the word of their God. In every culture there have been priests, medicine-men, witch-doctors, shamans, exorcists and mediums said to be inspired with "gifted tongues" and alleged to be able to communicate with the supernatural.

II

How does speech normally develop in the child? It begins in a natural way, with the birth cry. In the first few months of life the infant usually coos and babbles and, by the time he is five or six months old, he has made most, if not all, of the vowel sounds and many of the consonants. The first words are usually learned somewhere between eight and eighteen months of age. For instance, a child of fifteen to eighteen months of age may have a vocabulary of ten to twenty words or even more. Also, somewhere between the ages of fifteen and thirty months, he may begin to

couple two words together to form phrases or sentences. At first his words are usually imperfectly formed and his speech is referred to as "baby talk". As he continues to grow, he learns to articulate more clearly and his speech becomes more intelligible. At age two, the whole linguistic apparatus including lips, tongue, larynx and thorax undergo rapid organization. Jargon begins to drop out as sentences begin to emerge. Soliloquy now takes the place of the babbling present in infants. He can now, that is at the age of two, use his vocabulary to name things, express some of his assertions and to suit words to action. By the age of three and a half to five years, more complicated sentences and expressions are used, until he develops a fairly distinct speech pattern.

In the development of thought in the child there are usually three stages, which develop alongside of his language and which follow in natural succession. The first state, that of physiognomic thinking, is one in which the child animates objects and projects his own ego into them. When he plays with a broom and calls it a horse, we have an example of physiognomic thinking. As the child grows older, he develops a second stage of thinking which is referred to as "concrete thinking". In this stage of thinking, the child is realistic and literal. For instance, if he refers to a "table" or a "chair", he does not mean tables or chairs in general, but the particular table or chair he is referring to at the specific time. Finally, he uses language to form abstractions and generalization, which comes later in the development of the individual and with some formal or informal education. The last type of thinking is called "abstract thinking" or "categorical thinking".

The culture or society in which we live has a definite imprint on our means of communication. In our particular Western culture where the emphasis on verbal expression plays such a dominant role, it is not too difficult to understand the conflicting tendencies and anxieties that result in relation to speaking. It is to some extent because of this factor that we find such a marked prevalence of stuttering in our population. In those cultures where less stress is placed on the importance of the spoken word, the tendency toward stuttering is also diminished. D. John C. Snidecor, speech professor at the University of California, some time ago reported a visit of several months among the Shoshone and Bannock Indian tribes of southeastern Idaho. He personally interviewed 800 full-blooded Indians and reported on the re-

ceived reports of 1,000 more. Not one stuttered. This is in marked contrast to the 18 or 40 stutterers who would have been discovered in a comparable segment of our own society. Snidecor believes that these tribes have escaped stuttering because, in general, they have escaped the "stutter-causing pressures of modern civilization," because parents never urge their toddlers to speak, "for display purposes," and because no stigma is attached to non-speaking on the part of adults; the Indian may sit and cogitate awhile and then feel under no obligation to explain his reasoning. From these keen observations of Snidecor, we can see that, in these cultures where there is less pressure regarding the use of verbal communication and where the individual can feel some sense of choice and security in his form of expression, there is less tendency toward disturbed speech. The latter occurs mainly in those situations where the individual feels threatened and opposed in a particular speaking situation.

The onset of verbal communication begins early in life. The child at this period of development discovers that he is able to express through words and gestures his inward wants and desires. He also discovers that he is not a totally independent being, but dependent upon his environment for acceptance and social approval. He further discovers that his earliest conflicts become expressed in his communications, both verbal and social, in relation to his parents. Where serious conflicts arise in early childhood, the child becomes threatened, anxiety is generated and it is in the specific area of verbal communication that it is first experienced and expressed. Speaking which is normally used to convey an opinion, an attitude, a feeling, or an assertion, becomes instead a situation identified and experienced with fear and hostility. The speaking situation automatically becomes the forerunner of future difficulties and uncertainties. Each subsequent attempt to speak, when under similar conflict, is met with increasing doubt, fear, apprehensions and anxieties. Conflicts arise between a rational desire to speak and express one's self and the opposing tendency which arises as a result of speaking.

III

Speech is a fundamental aspect of the whole personality. Its function is not only to communicate verbally, but is also an expression of the individual's interpersonal relations. Free flowing and spontaneous speech begins in a child for the most part in an environment of parental warmth,

freedom and one in which the child feels accepted. However, because of the presence of unhealthy factors in the personalities of some parents such as strict and perfectionistic fixations on good diction — some children (including many stutterers) become anxious and speech conscious. This in turn leads to the development of an inevitable vicious circle which perpetuates further speech blockages and more anxiety. Later on, additional crises in the speaking situation—such as disturbing events in school, a tonsillectomy, a sudden fight or psychic trauma—accentuate specific taboos which are set up in the speaking situation and verbal expression now begins to become identified with fear, resentment and struggle.

Once neurotic tendencies set in, a person experiences being divided within himself and senses a feeling of inadequacy and unrelatedness. In his chaotic attempts to rise above his conflict and arrive at some form of pseudo-integration, he creates a false image of himself which can temporarily give him simultaneously a feeling of identity, power and significance. Especially in people who have difficulty in the speaking situation, the tendency is toward creating what I call an "image of Demosthenes" in their own imaginative picture of themselves. They tend to feel that, if they could only talk perfectly clear and lucidly at all times, they could become omnipotent and God-like. Or, they imagine themselves at one and the same time as great orators, able to hold vast audiences spellbound. Their speech begins to dominate their life activities to the exclusion of everything else and they may compulsively feel driven to excel in something which they feel is defective in themselves—the art of oral communication. Personalitywise, such as a person may feel that he should also be the wittiest, the most intelligent and brilliant, and especially so when he speaks. In relation to himself, he should always be sincere, honest, gracious, understanding, considerate, dignified and unselfish. He should never complain or feel annoyed and always feel loving and kind toward others. In essence, he should be the epitome of perfection.

In our particular culture setting, there is frequently found an overemphasis, in terms of importance and value, placed on the intellect. To achieve recognition or position one must be "intelligent," "business-wise," "quick on the draw," "know the important people," "use the right lingo," etc. To be impressive when speaking, master of one's words, to have a "keen personality" — these

are too often regarded as indispensable assets.

Words and magic were once one and the same thing. Today words still retain much of their magic power. The child, for instance, learns early in life the value of omnipotence in words and its relationship to the spoken language. Speech becomes an instrument for the mastery and manipulation of his environment. It is through this medium of expression and communication that he acquires knowledge and experience and tells of his need for affection and reassurance.

As the individual continues to grow and develop, he discovers even further the omnipotence of words. With words he finds he can control and master things about him. Using the "right" or the "wrong" word can be of significant importance. "Words can kill and resurrect." "Words are dangerous, powerful, destructive," and should be used with discretion. Words become filled with feeling and emotion. They can reveal one's personality and innermost thoughts, feelings, resentments and envies. Words penetrate at times our deepest defenses and readily reveal our finest intentions and beliefs.

IV

In the stutterer, for example, the spoken word carries with it an effect of tremendous imprint and impact. Beginning early in life he learns that speaking can easily upset his personality equilibrium and bring about inner chaos and the eruption of fear and anxiety. He also learns through experience that a mastery and control over his words is one of his only means of salvation. He finds, finally, that it is imperative to measure his words, to use them with utter care and caution and that "a careless word can cause a calamity". The speaking situation becomes his arena of combat — the one place where he can emerge the victor or succumb to the mercy of others.

Problems in speech are as old as speech itself. It has a history that dates back to time immemorial and at least to the ancient Egyptians. The graphic symbol for stuttering, for instance, is said to have been found in the hieroglyphics. Speaking and language difficulties are mentioned in the Bible and by the ancient philosophers. Moses is reputed to have been a stutterer. Others with speech defects have included Aristotle, Aesop, Demosthenes, Virgil, Erasmus and Charles Lamb. And coming down to the modern day, we have Henry James, Somerset Maugham, the late George the Sixth and Sir Winston Churchill.

What are some of the essential qualities and differences that distinguish a so-called "normal speaker" from a neurotic or "disturbed speaker"? Aristotle believed the speaker must establish the idea that he is a person of intelligence; that he is of strong moral character; and that he is a person of good-will and friendliness. At one time in early civilization, it was felt that having a speech deviation was identified with a certain distinction. The latter was exemplified in a story related about a prince of long ago who had a severe speech impediment. So proud was he of his halting speech that he issued a decree stating that blocking was a royal prerogative and anyone not of princely blood who spoke in similar fashion would meet death by the axe.

The average speaker usually experiences his speech as his own and originating from within himself. He feels a choice of his own words or group of words, though there may be some indecision as to pronunciation. But once he has made up his mind to speak and voluntarily chooses his words, he will have little difficulty in consummating the speaking itself. The person who has difficulty speaking, however, generally experiences his speech as alien to himself and as coming from somewhere outside of himself. He may experience little choice in deciding upon one or another word but must choose between "word entities". Where some anticipatory dread is present in all of us before beginning to speak, it usually lessens or disappears once speech is initiated. In the anxious speaker, however, such as found in the extreme in stutterers, these anxieties and fears usually increase to practically uncontrollable nature, so that he feels compelled either to take flight from speaking altogether, and thus avoid the unpleasantness of the situation or else feel forced to enter into this same situation with a feeling of doom, confusion and doubt as to its ultimate outcome.

In any particular speaking situation, the average speaker does have some degree of control over the situation and can decide upon a course of action without too much emotional balance. There are some speakers, however, who become fearful and anxious even before attempting to speak, so much so that they are unable to help themselves predetermine their behavior before speaking. They may attempt to alleviate dread and uncertainties by communicating before hand to themselves the thought that they will not become

frightened or that they will speak slowly or easily. However, when the actual time for action in speaking occurs, they find themselves anxious and frightened in the speaking situation.

The average speaker when he blocks or has some similar difficulty in speaking is spontaneous and flexible to the extent of voluntarily stopping speech when he anticipates, or is in, difficult speaking circumstances. The "perfectionistic speaker," however, presents rigidity to change and stubbornly attempts to "stick to" his originally intended position. For to have to admit discrepancies or flaws to his own notion of perfection is a severe blow to his pride. He "should" not show weakness when speaking and to become ruffled or to deviate slightly is felt by such a speaker as a "sign of weakness".

V

Another sort of disturbed speech is found in the "retiring, self-effacing, dependent speaker." He seems to color a great deal of what he says with the particular mood or feelings he may be experiencing at the time he is speaking. He is unable to keep these varying reactions to himself, but feels compelled and driven to demonstrate these feelings to others. Since the success or failure of what he says is highly dependent upon the acceptance or disapproval of others, he gears his speech to meet and suit what he feels as demands coming from others. He is strongly dependent upon the reactions of his audience, be it one or more people. Towards others, when he speaks, he may experience himself as though he were "on stage". He then sees himself as the former, at the mercy of his critics — the audience. This latter feeling of criticism or rebuff in the speaking situation is typically experienced in stutterers.

The "compulsive speaker" feels compelled to speak frequently and in most cases is frightened to stop speaking for fear of its consequences. He also feels obligated to and tied down by his audience in the speaking situation. He needs to control his audience and to keep it intact. When he speaks he demands absolute attention. No one must be bored, or leave, lest he become irritable or even enraged. Soon after he is through one of his machine-like compulsive spiels, he listens momentarily to what his audience has to say, then interrupts and recontinues his driven speech. His vanity in himself as a "wonderful and absorbing" speaker, of necessity compels him to come alive only by living vicariously through others and by hearing himself speak.

A third, and last, type of speaker I have attempted to categorize is the "indifferent or resigned speaker." He is usually known as the "man of few words." He feels compelled to speak only when referred to, when he has something of tremendous importance to say, or when, with a few words, he can deliver the final and lethal blow to a heated discussion. At other times, however, he may stop in the middle of a sentence, shrug his shoulders with an attitude of "I don't care," or assume a smile of indifference. Finally, in these same people, any attempt to have them repeat something they may have said and which may not have been heard or understood, is met with the characteristic retort: "It can't be so important that you want me to repeat it." The resigned speaker takes pride in peaceful solutions and is highly sensitive to pressures or coercion of any kind. In this same group we find those who take a peculiar pride in being labeled as "good listeners," and may show a superiority or dislike for others whom they consider as "chatterers" or "long-drawn-out speakers".

VI

Your speech can reveal yourself and your most inner feelings and emotions. Dr. Paul Moses, Assistant Clinical Professor of Laryngology at Stanford University's School of Medicine and head of the Stanford Clinic for Speech and Voice Disease, says, "You do with your voice what you do with your mind. When you want to disappear, you make your voice small. When you feel aggressive, you squeeze the opening at the top of your throat just as you flex the rest of your muscles, and your voice comes out hard and explosive. When you feel anxious, you pull in not only your horns but also your vocal cords, and you sound strained and tense."

Treatment of speaking difficulties, providing they are of an emotional variety, should consist of not only vocal exercises and suggestions, but may include the whole personality of the individual. In my book *Stuttering* and in Dr. Moses' *The Voice of Neurosis*, we both conclude that the speech therapist must treat the person, not the disorder. In a recent review in *Today's Speech* of both these books, the reviewer concluded with a most stimulating and challenging remark: "To what extent a speech therapist should or must be a psychotherapist is a question raised long ago by the psychology and speech correction fields. Both of these works should rekindle an intense interest in the search for a suitable answer."

GETTING THE MOST OUT OF THOSE MEETINGS

By Ernest W. Fair

Reprinted from *THE SAMPLE CASE*, official publication of The United Commercial Travelers.

"Better I should have stayed at home playing scrabble with my wife!"

This statement (or one with the same meaning) has been made by many a salesman as he wearily made his way home from a business or sales meeting, club, lodge, or other meeting with a distinct feeling of having thoroughly and completely wasted an evening.

SOME TIMES this just can not be helped; we all know there are such gatherings at which it is utterly impossible to acquire anything useful. However these are a lot fewer than we think. The people who stage those meetings usually put a great deal of work into them and actually present a lot of material and ideas. Too often the fault is entirely our own when we go away from them empty handed.

Realizing this we have asked a number of people who DO secure a lot of benefit from such meetings how they go about doing it . . . and from their suggestions here are some ideas we can all use.

FIRST, we're told, it is of the utmost importance that we go into such a meeting, particularly those of a business nature, with an absolutely clear mind. We must be prepared to focus our attention on what is going on and what is being said and nothing else.

"The man who comes to a business meeting worrying about a couple of troublesome prospects, his golf game, how he is going to meet the next car payment or anything else has little chance of doing himself any good," one old timer told us.

When a salesman's mind is loaded with other problems he is lucky if he even hears what is being said. The human mind is not capable of doing a good job on more than one thing at a time.

"Experience has taught me that if I can not go into a meeting with the ability to concentrate one hundred percent on the agenda I may just as well go to the fights or a movie . . . fact is I will get a lot more good out of doing either one."

NEXT POINT is the art of concentration on what is being said and done. This calls for the development of a habit of becoming interested in everything that is said and the ability to listen through many boring statements in order to find the one thing worthwhile.

If our concentration is so poor that we start wondering whether or not the speaker has a toupee, how many men in the audience are faithful to their wives or the ability of the PA system to stand up . . . then we are apt to get very little out of anything being presented.

"How can I be expected to concentrate on such trivia?" a salesman once asked me, "There is not a thought in anything that fellow has said up to now and the chances are there will not be anything in what he says from now on."

ONCE IN AWHILE we have to admit, such a statement is correct BUT we are the losers in the long run for not giving this inept speaker full concentration. No matter how much trivia he may dispense he can not fail to give us at least one good idea in his speech. More important, however, is that relaxing our concentration toward one speaker or demonstration means we are going to relax on the next . . . and that second presentation may be a very good one.

Such ability to concentrate is something we develop into a habit. When this has been done we will automatically give the subject our fullest attention all of the time and never miss the really important information when it does come along.

SOME SALESMEN have the ability to turn

such concentration on and off as though it were controlled by an electric switch. That is an asset to be prized for it enables us to obtain rest and relaxation while the speaker is covering ground we already know. However it comes only from long practice which is built on full and complete concentration all of the time in its early stages.

THERE IS ANOTHER thing that is very important. It is the very simple requirement of always making sure we have a small notebook and pencil with us wherever we go. Many times each reader has heard something of value in such a presentation with great delight; only to find four hours later his memory had failed in noting a most important set of figures or statement. We just can not depend on memory for these things.

Making an occasional note is a reporter's trick we can all use; a single phrase or set of figures so noted can often recall several passages made in the presentation many days later. The memory ability most of us possess is seldom all inclusive; it must have starters and prompters which can bring forth the whole file in our private memory bank many weeks later.

THERE ARE SUCH THINGS as finding the right spot to sit which can add or detract from what we are able to secure from any meeting. If we are surrounded by a noisy bunch of individuals who make it impossible to hear everything that is being said it will pay us to get up and move. If there is someone nearby who distracts us considerably (a nervous person, a beautiful girl, etc.) then we will get much more out of that meeting also by moving.

Finding a spot where there are no lights in our eyes, where we can have a clear view of the stage or platform, where there are not hot or cold discomforts... all of these things can add not only to our enjoyment of the affair but our ability to get something worthwhile out of what is happening.

MANY SALESMEN find also that they get more out of any type of meeting by taking an "active working interest" in what the speaker is developing. As the presentation goes along they argue mentally with what is being said, develop points further on the basis of their own knowledge, etc.; they seek out those points of greatest interest and develop them into something of their own. This creates definite fixed memories they carry with them for a long time into the future.

THIS BUSINESS of evaluating what is going on deserves some mention also. If in listening to a presentation we decide then and there that the whole thing is utter and stupid nonsense the chances are we have built us a "road block" for the entire evening. If we dismiss any thought of evaluation and still give the speaker full concentration, we can assimilate ideas for later (and very possibly much better) evaluation. In the meantime we have kept an open and interested mind throughout the entire evening. That early "road block" was certain to exclude something of importance that occurred afterwards in the meeting.

"Long ago I developed an approach that has rewarded me handsomely," a salesman friend told us the other day, "by just making up my mind before I went to any meeting that I was going to take home one worthwhile thing from that meeting. Soon I found myself working hard to find that idea in what was being said and done. In all the years since I have never failed to find at least one such idea by really looking for it; and I know that I missed a lot before then by not having developed that approach."

He has something there; we know from our own experience. We have attended some pretty boring meetings in our time but through application of the foregoing suggestions all of them have developed something worthwhile for us.

Besides... we're kind of tired of scrabble anyway!

"A man's power to connect his thoughts with its proper symbol, and so to utter it, depends on the simplicity of his character, that is, upon his love of truth and his desire to communicate it without loss. The corruption of man is followed by corruption of language." Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Language," from *Nature*.

How to Make A Communication Survey

By Thomas R. Nilsen

Dr. Nilsen, (Ph.D., Northwestern), Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, shares some of his experience in conducting industrial communications surveys.

Increasingly, professional speech people are being called upon to teach courses in communication to personnel in business, industry, and government, and to assist in developing more effective communications within individual organizations. The more such teaching and consulting, especially the latter, deals with problems in the informal day-to-day communications of a particular organization the more intimate a knowledge is needed of its people and their interactions. The closer and more continuing the relationship among people the more the communicating among them is inseparable from their beliefs and attitudes, from everyday satisfaction and frustrations, from the total pattern of the human relations of the organization.

It is the purpose of this paper to present a method of surveying the communications within industrial, business, or government units that will help the consultant¹ discover the communication weaknesses and failures, the human factors underlying them, and the procedures contributing to them, so that he can more effectively help the organization develop the kind of communications that will contribute most to its successful functioning.²

The plan is very flexible. Each survey need not include all the items mentioned, nor need all the areas be exhaustively examined. The degree of thoroughness and the scope of the study will depend upon personnel available to make the study, the time that can be allotted to it, and the needs of the organization surveyed. One person can

make a rewarding study in two weeks of a department of upwards of one hundred people. And, fortunately, such a departmental study can provide the information necessary for a significant improvement of communication throughout the entire organization.

EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURE

I Preliminary arrangements

In beginning such a survey the plan should be carefully explained to management and the possible results suggested. It must be made clear that the survey may not be very successful unless management helps to create favorable attitudes toward it. It is important that management discuss the survey with supervisory personnel, indicating its own interest in the study as a means of helping the organization function more effectively, and calling for full cooperation with the investigator. Unfortunately there too often exists the suspicion that management has ulterior or selfish motives in having such studies made. There should also be a meeting of supervisory personnel with the investigator and a member of top management where questions may be asked and any doubts aired and discussed. Supervisory personnel should then, in turn, tell their employees about the survey, explain the confidential nature of the interviews to be held, and ask for their help in making the study a success.

The next step is the making of a diagram, with the help of management, of the formal structure of the organization, showing the lines of authority and communication. This diagram will help the investigator understand some of the relationships among people in the organization, and will make possible a later comparison between the formal and informal lines of communication.

II Interviews

Arrangements are made in whatever manner most acceptable to management for interviews with supervisory personnel. Following this, plans are made with each supervisor for interviews with

¹ While the method presented here will mainly interest the person doing consultant work, making this type of survey provides the teacher with invaluable background for teaching communication.

² This article is written primarily for the individual trained in speech who is dealing with communication problems in business, industry, or government. It therefore assumes a broad knowledge of speech communication and limits itself to outline a program and giving some specialized information gained from experience in making communication surveys.

his employees. Care must be taken that the supervisor will not choose employees to bias the results; the employees interviewed should be a rough cross-section of pay grades and types of work. Finding opportunities for interviews often becomes increasingly difficult as one proceeds down the line because personnel become progressively more subject to the immediate demands of the job. Since adequate interviews require from one-half to one hour, care must be taken to fit the interview program into the routine of the plant. The investigator may find it time-consuming to arrange for interviews and to wait for busy supervisors and employees, but tact and thoughtfulness here will pay off in favorable attitudes toward the study.

While several interviews at the management and supervision levels should take place before interviews with employees begin, the former should not be completed prior to the latter. The earlier interviews at upper levels are important to give the investigator an insight into the operation of the plant. At the same time, however, attitudes revealed by employees, and their interpretations of policies and practices will provide an awareness of existing problems that will make subsequent interviews with management and supervision more rewarding. Observations (discussed in the next section below) should also begin soon after the early interviews have provided an overview of the organization and its operation. Observations and interviews should alternate.

The most valuable interviews are those in which the interviewees talk about the things about which they feel most strongly, as, for instance, their feelings about supervision, promotions, information received, being treated like a human being. These are the things that are likely to affect their communication and interaction with other people. The interviews, therefore, should be structured as little as possible; the interviewer should not ask leading questions but try to create the permissive atmosphere that will bring about an expression of interests and feelings. If as the study progresses, however, certain pieces of information do not fit together, direct questions should be asked to clarify the picture.

In beginning an interview with a member of management or supervision, it is well to restate briefly the purpose of the survey and then simply to ask for a description of the things that seem to stand in the way of the best functioning of the organization. Whether with management or em-

ployees, it is usually unprofitable to ask directly about communication problems. The relationship between communication and other aspects of human relations is usually not adequately understood or appreciated, and the interviewer learns more about the communication problems through descriptions by personnel of personnel problems and of things they like and don't like than from their direct statements about communication.

The first few interviews may seem of limited value, but as the investigator's awareness of problems increases he can stimulate talking by a passing reference to some of these problems. When the interviewees discover that the interviewer already knows about some of the situations or conditions they ordinarily discuss, they are much more likely to talk freely about them and to introduce others. For this reason repeat interviews, especially with the first several people interviewed, are valuable. Also, personnel may recall things that did not come to mind the first time.

In interviewing employees it is important to restate for each person the purpose of the study and the confidential nature of the interview. Though they will already have been told this it is important that these statements and assurances come directly from the interviewer at the time of the interview. The location of the interview is important. It is highly desirable to take the employee to a private room, for if the interviewee can be seen by several others, even though not heard by any, he is less likely to speak freely. Employees do not seem to mind being seen going to and from the interview; in fact, this usually has some prestige value. Notes should be taken during the interviews; except in rare cases this does not inhibit the interviewee. Indeed, the writer had one employee express disappointment that no notes were taken; he said that he supposed that nothing he had said had been important enough to record.

An effective way of stimulating employees to talk about problems is to ask them to tell about the things they feel make the work more difficult than it should be, or that stand in the way of good human relations, or that get in the way of the best operation of the plant. Sometimes it is helpful to ask them to tell how other employees feel about these things. Most employees are responsive and willing to contribute what they can, but occasionally an employee will be encountered who is totally unresponsive. This is to be expected,

and time should not be wasted in a prolonged effort to get him to talk; thank him and proceed to the next interviewee.

It should be noted that statements made by the interviewee cannot always be taken at face value. Descriptions of objective conditions are usually accurate. Descriptions of other personalities and their motivations are singularly unreliable. The latter are so much a projection of the employees' feelings that they must be interpreted more as an indication of their attitudes than as descriptions of the persons in question. The interviewer must always be conscious of the "manifest" and "latent" content of the interviewee statements. What the individual says explicitly and what he might mean implicitly, and even unconsciously, may be very different. It is through careful evaluation of all data that conclusions are drawn about personnel attitudes, misunderstandings, frustrations, personality problems, misconceptions. Restraint must be exercised so that conclusions are not drawn prematurely.

The interview provides an opportunity to note some of the characteristics of personnel interviewed, and their habits of talking. Especially in the case of managerial and supervisory personnel it is important to note the things about which they talk dogmatically, critically, openly, furtively; also it is important to note the assumptions they make about people, about their own knowledge in general, their sensitivity to the human factor, their awareness of communication and its relation to other problems, and how they see themselves in relation to the problems of the organization.

III Observations

The investigator professionally trained in speech will have little difficulty in seeing many of the weaknesses in or obstacles to communication in the communication procedures he observes. The observations can, however, be misleading, since people often talk and act the way they feel they ought to talk and act rather than the way they would like to. An employee may be very polite and attentive to the boss he dislikes because of the importance of the boss's decision to his livelihood. The communications within an organization where people have worked together over a long period of time are so inextricably a part of the total behavior complex of the people involved, and so much of it goes on unconsciously, that the relatively formalized, observable communication processes are but the part of the iceberg that shows.

The group situations, such as conferences and training sessions, that are a regular part of the organization's routine, can be observed with little adverse effect on the proceedings. More informal, intimate situations, however, such as criticism situations, interviews, impromptu instructions, can probably not be observed without the presence of the observer so changing the relationship as to greatly distort the communication process. Moreover, adverse attitudes may be fostered by attempts to observe situations where the individual ego is on trial. Almost all the information about the highly personal communication situation must be gleaned from supervisory and employee descriptions of them and attitudes toward them.

Induction procedures should be observed. Since new employees are not a part of the culture of the organization and have not been influenced by the many factors incident to the day-by-day job, their first impressions—which are often lasting—depend primarily upon what is communicated to them during the process of induction.

The observer can gather further data by simply observing the office or shop routine during the work day. He can note such things as the frequency of supervisory-employee contacts, how they are initiated and how responded to, the amount of social talking, the social groups that form at breaks. Since patterns of contact or communication tend to become quite stable in any work group a day's observation of routine is fairly representative.

IV Questionnaires

It is not necessary for the type of communication study here described to make a full scale survey of employee attitudes, helpful as such a survey might be. A relatively small sample of attitudes can be very significant to the communication study since it reveals typical communication weakness and communication blocs. As the adverse attitudes and their possible causes are discussed with personnel concerned—that is, as the communication channels are opened—other attitudes will be brought to light and other blocs to communication discovered.

V Evaluation

When the data from the interviews and observations are brought together, problems of communication within the organization will emerge. Problems will be indicated by such things as the differences in descriptions of and attitudes towards policies, practices, and people, and the lack

of awareness of many of these differences on the part of personnel concerned. Certain attitudes will indicate both communication failures and distorting influences on communication. The differences between the way employees feel and the way management and supervision think they feel will suggest important communication weaknesses.

Communication problems are often a function of the lack of awareness on the part of management and supervision of the many factors that influence communication, and a lack of sensitivity to the motivations of people. For instance, even where management is keenly conscious of the "human factor," the pervasiveness and intensity of the need for recognition and dignity on the part of the employees may not be adequately appreciated. Employees may feel that they are not treated "like human beings" at the same time that their supervisors explain at length how important it is to be tactful toward employees and to give them a sense of dignity and importance.

Much of the difficulty in communication stems from the simple fact that the more completely people are absorbed in the day-to-day routines of the job, the more they are an integral part of the human interactions of the job, the more dif-

ficult it is for them to see the existing problems, the causes of them, and the part they themselves play in them.

In addition to the discovery of communication problems and their causes, there should be certain valuable by-products from such a survey. The opportunity it affords for personnel to air certain of their feelings, to discuss problems of the job, to feel that their opinions are wanted, often results in more favorable attitudes toward the work and the organization. The people interviewed achieve a little more objectivity toward their own problems; they become a little more understanding of management's problems.

It is essential, however, that management follow up such a survey with observable action. The survey tends to build up employee expectations, and if nothing is said or done subsequently to the study in the directions indicated by it, it may have adverse rather than favorable results. No drastic changes should be instituted immediately. Good communication must grow and develop with improved human relations. But the survey must be discussed with personnel, and the kind of action taken by management will assure employees that the study was in fact made for the purpose of improving the functioning of the organization.

Plan for Communication Survey

I Preliminary arrangements

- A. Explaining plan to management
- B. Gaining acceptance of survey by management and supervision
- C. Learning structure of organization

II Interviews

- A. Interviews with members of management, supervision, and a sample of employees to obtain their respective descriptions of:
 1. Existing personnel relations and problems
 2. Nature of induction and training procedures and attitudes toward them
 3. Procedures in day-to-day instruction, order-giving, criticism, and attitudes evoked by them
 4. Attitudes toward the work, the organization, superiors, subordinates, peers
 5. Opportunities for and nature of communication among personnel at various levels and between levels
 6. General personnel policies and practices and employee attitudes toward them
- B. The same interviews permit the investigator to note several characteristics of the interviewees, such as:
 1. Attitudes not explicitly expressed
 2. Assumptions made
 3. Sensitivity to the feelings of people

4. Awareness of the motivations of people
5. Awareness of communication problems and their own involvement in them
6. Habits of talking that may hinder good communication

III Observations

- A. Communication situations to observe:
 1. Conferences and meeting of various kinds
 2. Induction and training sessions
 3. Impromptu instructions, criticism, discussions, question answering, commendation, information giving
 4. Nature and number of supervisory-employee contacts
 5. Nature and amount of social talking among employees
- B. Things to look for in the communication situation
 1. Physical structure and context of situations
 2. Permissiveness, participation
 3. Adequacy of leadership
 4. Purposiveness, clarity
 5. Idea content
 6. Reactions of personnel

IV Questionnaires

In a large company, simple questionnaires can be constructed to indicate the speed and intensity of employee attitudes.

V Evaluation of data

TEEDYUSCUNG — SPEAKER FOR THE DELAWARES

By Frank W. Merritt

Dr. Merritt (Ph.D. Cornell), Associate Professor of Speech at Bucknell University, contributes his third article to TODAY'S SPEECH.

When, in the spring of 1754, George Washington surrendered Fort Necessity, English prestige among the Indians of Ohio and Pennsylvania was severely damaged. Shaken, too, was the authority of England's allies, the Six Nations. Especially was it shaken among the Delawares, who became increasingly hostile, when, on July 6, 1754, their Iroquois overlords, without consulting them, conveyed to the English a large tract of territory west of the Susquehanna, reserving Wyoming, Shamokin, and lands contiguous to them for the Delawares. But even this reservation was weakened when a few chiefs, bribed with rum and gold, signed the reserved lands over to settlers from Connecticut. On April 11, 1755, Paxinosa, a Delaware chief, came to Philadelphia to lay the Delawares' land grievance before the governor; but the governor, fearing to offend his Iroquois allies, told him to go home and wait for orders.

That summer Braddock was defeated, the Ohio Delawares took up the hatchet against the English, and those on the Allegheny and the West Branch of the Susquehanna, decided to join them, despite orders from the Iroquois that they were to help the English. Soon white settlers were killed and scalped; cattle were slaughtered; and houses and barns were burned. It was July of 1756 before the English were able to gather the Delawares about the council fire at Easton to discuss peace. The speaker for the Delawares was Teedyuscung.

Though he was fifty-six years old, Teedyuscung was almost unknown before he spoke at Easton. He had come to Philadelphia with Paxinosa in April, 1755, and had spoken, but without effect. Now he came not only as speaker, but as a chief who had led a raid against the English. He was a man who was torn between admiration of the white man's ways and resentment of the white man's aggression. He seems to have been insecure and unstable all his life: he had accepted and renounced Christianity; he had courted the favor of both the French and the English; he had feared

the vengeance of both the whites and the Iroquois. Proud and sensitive, he bitterly resented the subordinate position in which the Iroquois held the Delawares. Eager for the favorable attention of important white men, he was highly suggestible—his point of view shifting sharply according to the company he kept. Yet, he could be independent, too, when his feelings were aroused. Worst of all, perhaps, he was such an inveterate drunkard that he could not be depended upon to appear for business; and sometimes, when he did appear, he was too fuddled to know what he was doing.

Nevertheless, he was a remarkable man. Conrad Weiser, who knew him well, said: "Though he is a drunkard and . . . very irregular, . . . yet he is a man that can think well, and I believe him to be sincere in what he said." He also had powers of expression which greatly impressed some of his white listeners. John Pemberton, who had heard both speak, compared him favorably with William Pitt, Earl of Chatham.

On July 25th, 1756, Robert Hunter, Lieutenant-Governor of Pennsylvania, opened the first of three conferences for making peace with the Susquehanna Delawares.

The audiences at these conferences were moderately large and rather distinguished. Governor Morris presided at the first and Governor Denny at the second and third. Among the notables present were Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Chew, Conrad Weiser, members of the governor's council, various commissioners, chiefs of the Iroquois, Delawares, Shawnees, and Mohicans, officers of the Royal American Regiment and of the provincial forces, magistrates and freeholders from Easton, and citizens from Philadelphia.

While speaking before this audience, Teedyuscung wore a dark brown cloth coat laced with gold, riding boots, shoes with buckles, checkered cloth trousers, and stockings with scarlet garters. His shirts were ruffled. On his head he wore a tricorne hat heavily plumed. Here was no chief in paint and feathers, but a Delaware who knew

the English manner and who could take snuff, drink rum, and play cards with the best of them.

The *Colonial Records* show that Teedyuscung made at least nine more or less lengthy speeches at these conferences, which were taken down and translated from the Delaware tongue, in which Teedyuscung preferred to speak, into English by John Pumpshire or Conrad Weiser, assisted by the Delaware Indians Joseph Peepy and Ben. These speeches were not reported in full, but enough is recorded to permit a limited exemplification of Pennsylvania Indian oratory in general and of Teedyuscung's speaking ability in particular.

The Six Nations, to whom the Delawares were related, held speech-making in high esteem. A loosely knit confederation of tribes, they regularly settled disputes and found solutions to problems over the council fire, where a grave and orderly ritual was observed. Treaty procedure was leisurely. The councilors usually listened impassively, then put off answering until they had conferred together and slept on what they had heard. A speaker, not necessarily a chief, chosen for his ability and for his familiarity with council procedure, was then told what to say by the councilors and was provided with belts of wampum to help him remember his points. The ritual required that the speaker take care to put his listeners in a friendly and receptive frame of mind. Harsh contentiousness was considered shockingly impolite. Grace, frankness, and courtesy were the speaking qualities held in esteem. The speaker was helped to achieve these qualities by a set order, content, and language. When his listeners were stirred to approval they might respond with a particular vocal sign which no two observers described alike, but which seems now to be remembered as "how." When his listeners were displeased they sometimes signalled their displeasure by quietly leaving the council-fire. But when thoroughly angered, they might forget decorum and vilify the speaker, occasionally even threaten him with physical harm, such as dragging him away by his hair.

Teedyuscung's speeches reflect the ritual form of Iroquois council fires. He began symbolically:

In conformity to an ancient and good custom established among our Ancestors, I now proceed to open your eyes and ears, and remove all obstructions out of your throats, that nothing may impede the attention ne-

cessary to be used in a manner of such importance as is now going on.

As he mentioned each main point, he gave the governor a string of wampum. Mindful of the fact that this was a peace council and that he had participated in the slaughter of white settlers, he continued in a conciliatory vein, still using the ancient Indian metaphors.

Some bad reports have lately been spread which deserve to be no more minded than the whistling of birds. These I would remove by this belt . . .

I am now arrived at the place appointed for the council fire, where we are to hold conferences together. I am come just to the door; I see a great deal of dirt and blood in it, which is grievous to us both; seeing this I take wing in my hand and I go into the house and sweep the dirt all into one place; I wipe off all the blood; I take up dirt and blood together; I throw it all to the leeward that it may be no more seen. I make the house quite clean . . . as our forefathers used to do when they came to transact an affair of so great importance as to brighten the chain of friendship and make a firm and lasting peace.

The body of his speeches, like those of other Indians, was likely to be rather loosely organized in chronological-topical form. Each new topic was punctuated by the exclamation: "Brother" and the offering of a belt of wampum several strings wide. These belts served a double purpose: they prompted the speaker's memory and served as a confirmation and record of what he had said. Sometimes, in reply, a speaker would take up the belts in the order in which he had received them, speak on the topic each symbolized, and return them one by one. These ceremonial belts were often quite elaborate in design. At the Easton Conference of July 29, 1756, Teedyuscung showed a belt which he had from the Six Nations, saying:

I have in my hand but have not opened it . . .

This belt holds [sic] together ten nations; we are in the middle between the French and the English; look at it . . . see the dangerous circumstances I am in, strong men on both sides, hatchet on both sides; whoever does incline to peace, him will I join.

Upon delivering this belt to the Governor, he explained its design further:

You see a square in the middle meaning the lands of the Indians, and at one end the figure of a man, indicating the English, and at the other end another, meaning the French; our Uncles (the Six Nations) told us that both coveted our lands; but let us join together to defend our lands against both.

Such a belt not only dramatized the speaker's points, but functioned as a document.

Evidence and argument are not stressed in Teedyuscung's speeches. When he was asked why the Delaware's had struck the English, Teedyuscung said that the principle cause was past events which were not pleasing to the Indians. Pressed to explain what he meant, he revealed that the Indians resented being cheated of their land. This charge of fraud at once became the major issue and stumbling block to the peace. Teedyuscung claimed that a deed had been forged to lands never sold and that the English had bought from one chief land that belonged to another, but he produced no proof of these charges. He simply assumed that the mere fact that he had made the charge put on the English an obligation to see that something be done about it. If no justice was to be done, he implied, he would not have asked for it.

It is plain from the colonial records that the Indians, and Teedyuscung was no exception, were unfamiliar with the legal procedures of the white man in disputes over land. Without witnesses and written records of previous councils, without copies of the deeds, and without the ability to read, the Indians were hopelessly at a disadvantage in arguing for consideration of their claims.

Weak in logical proof, Teedyuscung relied chiefly on ethical and emotional proofs to move his audience. He was careful, especially in speeches at the beginning of conferences, to establish his authority to make peace.

I am here by the appointment of ten nations, among which are my Uncles; the Six Nations, authorized me to treat with you . . .

I assure you there are only two kings appointed to transact public business, of which I am one.

But he was careful not to exaggerate his authority: "I am but a messenger from the United Nations," he added. This addition was to be unfortunate, despite its truth; for the English hesitated to conclude a peace with such a weak ambassador and told him to go and arouse the

support of other Pennsylvania Indians. But Teedyuscung was fond of urging his truth and honesty in his speeches, saying often: "I will tell you the truth with an honest heart—as far as in my power."

At times he spoke modestly of himself: "I am before you, just what you see me. I represent myself to be only a boy. I am really no more." But at other times he expanded under the stress of the moment and subject:

Now, as misfortunes have happened by the Bad Spirit, by our Enemy and by some of our foolish young people, I declare unto you the truth that I have ever been sorry to see it thus, and as far as I know myself, if it cost me my life, I would make it otherwise.

Authority, probity, humility, modesty, and nobility were the colors in which he clothed himself as he pleaded for peace and justice from the white man. These qualities were evidently attractive to his audience, especially when they were combined with a skillful delivery. It is said of him at this conference:

Teedyuscung's imposing presence, his earnestness of appeal, and his impassioned oratory, as he pled the cause of his long-injured people, evoked the admiration of his enemies themselves.

His speeches tended to put a moral burden of justice and pity on the English.

We are poor and you are rich; make us strong and we will use our strength for you. We will not sneak away and hide your words and presents in the bushes. Exert yourselves now in the best manner you can.

After he had reluctantly charged that land fraud lay at the bottom of Delaware hostility toward the English, he said:

I did not intend to speak thus, but I have done it at this time, at your request; not that I desire now that you should purchase these lands, but that you should look in your hearts, and consider what is right, and that do.

Once he said, slyly, that the English must use the powers God had given them; for they were more highly favored by God.

His style was embellished with many simple figures of speech drawn from the woodland life. His figures have an Homeric simplicity, and like many of Homer's epithets, were well-worn coins of language highly valued by the Indians. A treaty he compared to a planting of corn: it may be begun well, but if it is not tended afterwards, it

will fail to bear ears. His abilities in treaty-making were like those of a boy, who brings a few chips to the fire. To make a treaty is like trying to lift a great weight; if all do not exert their strength they cannot move it; but if all join, they can do it so easily. The peace was like a good tobacco of which both the English and the Indians could enjoy the smoke. The frequent use of simile and symbol gives to the speeches a poetic flavor not often found in English oratory.

Teedyuscung had a mind and heart of his own. It was this quality of independence that his Indian listeners criticized most in him, saying he could never be depended upon to do what he had been told. But it is a quality that raises his speeches above the routine of ritual. It appears dramatically in his speech at the Easton conference of November 12, 1756. Goaded by the governor to say why the Delawares attacked the English, he suddenly abandoned the polite formality, the carefully chosen figures and the guarded language, and the words which fell from his lips sprang from his bitter heart.

This very ground which is under me (striking it with his foot) was my land and inheritance, and is taken from me by fraud . . . A bargain is a bargain. Tho' I have sometimes had nothing for the lands I have sold but broken pipes or such trifles, I look upon the bargain to be good. Yet I think I should not be ill-used on this account by those very people who have such an advantage in their purchases, nor be called a fool for it. Indians are not such fools as to bear this in their minds. The proprietaries who have purchased their lands from us cheap, have sold them dear to poor people, and the Indians have suffered for it . . . now, at length, you will not allow us to cut a little wood to make a fire; nay, hinder us from hunting, the only means left us of getting our livelihood.

Whatever the effects of these words may have been on his listeners, they strike us today as expressing eloquently the pent up bitterness of the slow, inexorable retreat of the Indian before the advancing white man.

He expressed his independence in other ways, too.

Seeming to realize the disadvantage he suffered in speaking without documentary evidence, at one point in the conference, he refused to proceed without having a personal secretary to keep minutes of the meeting. When the governor expostu-

lated that this was contrary to all Indian custom, Teedyuscung politely said that since he thought the white man's way was good, he wished the Indians to have it also. The governor gave in. Later when Teedyuscung rose to dispute a point in the proceedings, his secretary told him he was mistaken. Teedyuscung asked whether the record showed him to be so; when he was assured that it did, he sat down.

A final mark of his independence is the plan he offered the governor for accommodating the Indian to the advance of white civilization. He wished the Delawares to settle with him at Wyoming on lands which had fixed boundaries and which could not be sold. There he wished to have the English help them "build houses different from what we have done before, such as may last only for a little time, but for our children after us." He wished also that instructors might be sent to teach the Christian religion and instruct the children in reading and writing.

His speaking was not without effect. He pressed his claims to land so successfully that the governor had the deeds brought to Philadelphia for Teedyuscung to see. He might have gotten more than a wagon load of presents, as compensation for his grievance, had not Lapachpiton, another Delaware chief, angered beyond endurance because of Teedyuscung's stress on the claim of fraud, scolded and shouted:

Has not your Brother desired you to bring us down by the hand to make peace? Why don't you do it? We have been here these twenty days, and have heard nothing but scolding and dispute about lands. Settle the peace and let all these disputes stand till after. You continue to quarrel about the land affair which is dirt, a dispute we did not hear of till now.

Teedyuscung became sullen and confused by this outburst. Forgetting his speeches and the advantage he enjoyed, he rose, tied two belts together and extended them to the Governor. Peace was concluded. The Easton Conference closed on an anticlimax. Teedyuscung's land claims were never to be acknowledged, but his plan for resettlement received serious consideration. Some time later, the Governor sent builders to Wyoming, and several permanent houses and cabins were erected. For a while it looked as though Teedyuscung might have a chance to fulfil the dream for which he had pleaded: permanent land, a stable life, and peaceful co-exis-

tence with the white man. But one night a party of white settlers from Connecticut burned the cabins. Teedyuscung was in one, dead drunk per-

haps, and was burned to death along with the grievances and the dreams for which he had pleaded so eloquently.

Your Christmas Gift Subscriptions of Today's Speech

...will bring the readers in the January issue an analysis of automation in the classroom, by Edward J. Thorne, and a note on Semantics in Industry by Melville Hopkins. Lionel Crocker will explain and illustrate "How to Make the Illustrations Linger." From Leah Sherman (chosen "Citizen of the Week" in Portland, Oregon) comes a plea for a revival of conversation — and from Ray Irwin of Syracuse, N. Y., a plaint that radio drama never was an art worth getting excited about. Wayne Hoogestraat presents a delightful picture of a major Speech profession he feels is too little noted...auctioneering. Ruth Haun describes what the theatre is doing for internationalism. Carroll Arnold of Cornell University makes his annual roundup of "Trends in Speech." And this is just the first installment of your Christmas gift!

How 'dated' is your dictionary?

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY

of the American Language
COLLEGE EDITION

has been adopted by the Department of English at the new United States Air Force Academy, Denver, Colorado. Recommended at more than 700 colleges and universities.

IN VARIOUS BINDINGS, FROM \$5.00



THE WORLD PUBLISHING COMPANY • CLEVELAND 2, OHIO

What Do Students Care

About Freedom of Speech?

By George P. Rice, Jr.

George P. Rice, Jr., Ph.D., Cornell, is Educational Director of the National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship. His recent publication has dealt chiefly with problems of speech and law. In June 1956 he will be a candidate for the LL.B. degree at Indiana University School of Law. He is also professor of speech in Butler University.

INTELLIGENT AWARENESS OF PUBLIC OPINION as a force in man's affairs is at least as old as Homer. Orators from the Golden Age to the present have furnished plenty of evidence in their addresses to prove that able public speakers have been steadily conscious of its influence. Whenever representative governments are in power, public opinion is a factor of first magnitude in determination of the policies and issues at home and abroad. A federal Republic such as the United States is habitually conscious of its place and has even provided constitutional safeguards for its proper expression, particularly in the I, V, and XIV Amendments. Now American tradition looks both to speech and press as the chief media for formation and direction of opinion, though in recent years radio and television have combined to emphasize the importance of speech and its attendant, public assembly.

The advance of communism as a menace to free enterprise and the enormous growth of administrative agency law since 1933 have combined to focus attention upon the need to balance equitably the public interest in peace and security against the individual right to free legal expression. Government, of course, must have substantial popular support for the measures it uses to keep the balance.

Objective data reflecting attitudes of Americans on free speech are scant. This is true of the public at large and of special groups. For example, do we know how well informed college students are on the state and federal constitutional guarantees which protect their rights to speech and assembly? What are the comparative roles played by habit and conscience, public opinion, and law in restraining their speech? Do they read about important current decisions of the United

States Supreme Court in speech and assembly cases? What is the ultimate value they place upon the right to speak freely? Are they in substantial accord with the philosophy and decisions of the High Courts in speech and assembly cases?¹

The teacher of speech has both a right to have and a duty to use suggestive answers to these questions as he ponders problems of curriculum, course content and the relation of his discipline to law at a time when the implications of the Fifth Amendment are a matter of incessant debate.

Informative efforts have been made from time to time by organizations such as The American Institute of Public Opinion to sample public attitudes toward free speech.² The results, though fragmentary and incomplete, indicate direction and method of needed additional studies. This report is written to provide some evidence about what some college students think of certain aspects of freedom of speech in America today.³

ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS

The reactions of 1000 students, divided evenly between an eastern state (New York) and a midwestern one (Indiana), to a questionnaire presenting basic issues of speech and law were obtained during a period of leisure made possible by The Fund for the Advancement of Education. Ten schools were visited: Albany Law School of Union University; Cornell University; City College of New York; The New York State College for Teachers; and Russell Sage College, in New York; Indiana was represented by Indiana University School of Law; Purdue University; Wabash College; De Pauw University; and Butler University. One hundred replies were taken at each institution, chiefly (90%) from classes in public speaking, during the autumn of 1953 and the spring of 1954.⁴

The evidence collected permits these inferences, among others:

1. The responses probably reflect with some accuracy the views of the students of public speaking generally, since much more than the statistical minimum necessary to support inferences was achieved.
2. Students appear reasonably well informed as to federal constitutional protection for speech and assembly, but notably deficient concerning their equivalents in state instruments.
3. They do not read about important speech and assembly decisions of recent years decided by the United States Supreme Court.
4. "Habit and conscience" has the strongest restrictive influence upon student utterance, followed by "public opinion" and "law."
5. An astonishing 12 per cent did not place speech in the category of "very high" values when asked to decide on the degree of value they place on the right to speak freely.
6. College students are notably more tolerant than adults in giving a hearing to speakers toward whose political views they are unsympathetic.
7. A majority entertain opinions on practical problems of free speech which are in accord with High Court principles and decisions in relevant cases.

Let us now examine in greater detail the questionnaire and responses which support these conclusions.

HOW MUCH FREEDOM

Three questions were put to ascertain knowledge of factual matters of speech and law.

No. 1. "Have you read and understood those parts of your state constitution which guarantee freedom of speech and assembly?" Only one in three could answer this question affirmatively. Indiana and New York stood about the same, though women (36%) were better informed than men (29.5%).

No. 2. "Have you read and understood the federal Bill of Rights, especially those parts which guarantee freedom of speech and assembly?" Eight of ten could write "yes" to this query and there was no differentiation between the states or the sexes.

No. 3. "Have you read or discussed recent (last 2-3 years) decisions of the United States Supreme Court cases affecting freedom of speech and assembly?" Only one in two could say he had.

New York students (53%) rated higher than Indiana's (46.5%). Men, by about the same margin, indicated they were better informed than women. Law students, as might have been expected, had a substantial (64%) lead over other disciplines, but City College of New York was the highest single school, with 66 per cent.

A succeeding group of four questions sought to determine the nature and importance of restrictions which students recognized on their public utterance.

No. 4. "Do you feel you can say pretty much what you please without fear of punishment by law?" A very large majority (85%) felt they could. Indiana collegians (91%) were less aware of legal restrictions than New Yorkers (81%). Women reported less awareness of such limitations than men, 89 per cent to 81 per cent.

No. 5. "Is public opinion a stronger factor than law in controlling your speech?" Three out of four (77%) said they were more influenced by public opinion than by law. While there was no difference between the two geographic areas, men (83%) were considerably more conscious of public opinion as a force than women (71%).

No. 6. "Is your speech restricted more by habit and conscience than by law?" Habit and conscience was far ahead of law, for 91 per cent acknowledged it over statutory or common law restraints. The two states were about the same, and men agreed with women in substance.

No. 7. "Is your speech restricted more by public opinion than by habit and conscience?" Two of every three voted for habit and conscience over public opinion as a stronger force in dictating how they spoke. More women (71%) than men (59%) spoke with greater care of habit and conscience.

Two additional questions were proposed to determine (a) the relative value students placed upon the right to free speech and assembly, and (b) to find out how much tolerance they possessed for the expression of unpopular views in their communities.

No. 8. "Do you set a 'very high' value, (in contrast to 'much' or 'little') on the privilege of saying what you think?" While a response of "very high" was returned by 800 students, it is cause for reflection to realize that 120 of the 1000 estimated its worth to them at "much" or "little." Indiana students (90%) were somewhat higher than New York's (85%) and men (92%) were notably higher than women (84%).

No. 9. "Would you object to a public appearance in your community by a well-known speaker if you held his political views repugnant?" Though Indiana (84%) was somewhat less liberal than New York (89%), the general response indicated an unusual degree of tolerance of opposing opinions, one greatly in contrast to the adult restrictions obtained by Dr. George Gallup in the survey cited earlier.

The final group of four questions was presented for the purpose of discovering data on the degree of accord (or lack of it) between student opinion and recent High Court decisions in relevant cases.

No. 10. "Do you feel your constitutional rights to free speech and assembly would be violated by a city ordinance which prevented you from speaking in a public park unless you first obtained a license from a city official with administrative discretion to deny it?"⁵ The Supreme Court held such an ordinance void, and a healthy majority of the students (71%) agreed. The Court's opinion found more support in Indiana than New York by 10 per cent margin. Men and women voted about the same.

No. 11. "Do you feel there is violation of the right of free speech where a speaker is restrained by police action for the use of offensive, threatening, insulting, or abusive language in public?"⁶ The Supreme Court held no violation and college opinion supported it by a margin of 53.5 per cent to 46.5 per cent.

No. 12. "Do you feel your constitutional rights to free speech would be violated if you were arrested for breach of the peace because your remarks stirred up auditors to the point of disorder?"⁷ The Supreme Court has not yet answered this question with finality, for the problem of the hostile audience is an intricate one. The Court held it a valid exercise of police power to restrain the speaker, but only where his continued utterance represented a clear and present danger to breach of peace. On this decision the students disagreed with the Court, as the nature of the case

might well permit. The poll revealed 47.5 per cent of the students in accord and the balance in dissent. New York students tended to agree with the Court by a narrow margin, Indiana's to oppose by an equally small majority.

No. 13. "Do you feel your constitutional rights to free speech would be violated by discharge as a civil service employee, including teachers, for refusal to swear a prescribed oath of loyalty disaffirming membership in or allegiance to the communist party?"⁸ The Court held such a requirement constitutional, and a majority (55%) of all the students agreed, with Indiana furnishing somewhat more support than New York.

The meaning of "free legal speech" and the proper application of that concept to speakers, speeches, and audience on the American scene today is a vital and continuing problem for the speech profession as well as for jurisprudence. It is no longer enough for rhetoric and public address to provide instruction in the traditional *what* and *how* of public speaking. An intelligent attention to the *why* of free speech and assembly will enable members of the speech profession to do good and useful service for the State once again.

¹ Mr. Justice W. O. Douglas has indicated judicial and personal interest in data on this question in a personal letter to the writer.

² E.g., releases of the Institute dated September 30, 1949 and December 5, 1953.

³ Background for this study may be read in my article, "Civil Liberty Challenges Rhetoric and Public Address," *THE EDUCATIONAL FORUM*, May 1953.

⁴ The total included 699 men and 301 women. Law, liberal arts, engineering, science, and professional education were represented. Age of respondents ranged from 17 to 28, with 95 per cent in the span 17-22.

⁵ Cf. *Niemotko v. Maryland*, 340 U. S. 268 (1950) and *Kunz v. New York*, 340 U. S. 290 (1951).

⁶ Cf. *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 315 U. S. 568 (1942).

⁷ Cf. *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U. S. 1 (1949) and *Feiner v. New York*, 340 U. S. 315 (1951).

⁸ Cf. *Gerende v. Board of Supervisors*, 341 U. S. 56 (1951) and *Garner v. Board of Public Works*, 341 U. S. 716 (1951).

PUBLIC SPEAKING —

SOURCE AND FORCE IN HISTORY

By W. David Lewis

With an M. A. in History, as well as being Instructor of Public Speaking at Hamilton College, Mr. Lewis sees historians taking increasing account of the vital force of eloquence.

Speaking before a meeting of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference in 1940, Dr. Robert T. Oliver, now Chairman of the Department of Speech at The Pennsylvania State University and Editor of *Today's Speech*, hurled a challenge at the history writing profession. "Historians," he charged, "have failed to portray accurately the currents and eddies, the progressions and retrogressions, of human history because they have not adequately considered one of the largest motivating forces—the influence of public speech."

Demonstrating that history was no longer merely a study of past politics but of all the vast and complex forces of human existence, Oliver held that these forces must be synthesized and presented to the public by articulate and well-informed leaders, often through the medium of public speaking. Citing many history books published during the 1920's and 1930's which exclude oral persuasion and its role in human development, Oliver concluded, "To be well written, history must properly interpret the historical significance of oratory."¹

The historian Joseph Ward Swain has stated, "A history is more than a chronicle of events: it is the historian's personal confession of faith as well."² Thus it was during the period of historiography which Oliver described; and the typical historian's faith was far more apt to be pragmatic than idealistic. This had a great effect upon the short shrift which historians gave rhetoric in their cosmology of human development. As the excellent economic historian Herbert Heaton

expressed it, "We are trying to see the farmer farming, rather than watching him go to granger meetings, embark on populist crusades, clamor for greenbacks, or lobby for more than a hundred per cent of parity."³

Many historians of this period were still determinists of one sort or another; and it can well be argued that any type of determinism has a tendency to make man a pawn surrounded by vast laws and forces which he can do little to control by the use of oratory or by any other means. Finally, it is fairly apparent that modern historiography has been to some degree influenced by that materialism which in most cases desires more tangible factors as causal agents than the somewhat hard-to-pin-down effects of speeches.

COUNTER-TREND

So far as American historiography is concerned, however, it appears that a counter-trend toward giving rhetoric its due has appeared in recent years. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., demonstrates how New England pulpit oratory served the conservative cause before and during the Jacksonian period. Richard Hofstadter makes frequent use of speeches as basic statements of political belief and doctrine in his book, *The American Political Tradition*, especially in chapters devoted to Lincoln, Wilson, and F. D. Roosevelt. A recent annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association devoted one of its sessions to a discussion of campaign oratory and campaign biography. In his recent presidential address before the American Historical Association, Merle Curti made explicit mention of the "hundreds of commencement orations and other academic addresses that I have had the doubtful pleasure of

¹ Robert T. Oliver, "A Rhetorician's Criticism of Historiography," in *Eastern Public Speaking Conference 1940*, (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1940), pp. 161-172.

² Joseph Ward Swain, "History and the Science of Society," in *Essays in Intellectual History Dedicated to James Harvey Robinson*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929), p. 317.

³ Quoted by W. Stull Holt, "Historical Scholarship," in Merle Curti, ed., *American Scholarship in the Twentieth Century*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 105.

reading," and documents various conclusions concerning anti-intellectualism in America by reference to speeches.⁴ There is clearly a revived interest in rhetoric among contemporary historians. What are the most fruitful ways in which such scholars are using public address as a factor in historiography?

A recent text-book in speech describes speech-making as "a social manifestation of man functioning at his highest level—the art of sharing his best thoughts, aspirations, and convictions with others."⁵ Thus, visible confrontation with his fellows in the speechmaking situation frequently provides the speaker with the stimulus to perform at his best; and it is perhaps in tacit admission of this fact that many contemporary historians use speeches not only as sources for intellectual history but as classic expressions of great ideas.

PURITANISM AND REFORM

Perry Miller, Professor of English at Harvard and a fine intellectual historian, has shown what can be accomplished in this regard by finding in two speeches, one by John Winthrop and the other by Jonathan Edwards, the juxtaposition of the old Puritan authoritarianism in New England and of its impending breakdown. As Miller indicates, strict Puritan orthodoxy held that man should accept his governing principles on a *priori* basis, chiefly from Holy Writ. The best statement of this belief was John Winthrop's speech of July 3, 1645. Liberty, Winthrop maintained, does not mean a state in which people should be able to make their rulers conform to their desires. "It is a liberty to do that only which is good, just, and honest"; and the rulers, not the people, decide what is "good, just, and honest," ostensibly using Scripture for their guide.

By 1748, however, this conception was breaking down through the influence of the "Great Awakening," and Miller makes it clear that Jonathan Edwards' "Eulogy of Colonel John Stoddard" was

the most precise and discerning statement of this trend. The use by Edwards of such terms as "the ability for the management of public affairs" is shown to mirror a conception of authority as being obliged to square itself with the hard facts of real social existence instead of with the Bible. Through acute textual criticism in the use of speeches as classic statements of great ideas, Miller thus throws a beam of light across the real significance of the "Great Awakening." Far from being purely religious in nature, it is shown to have involved a reversal of the concept of authority in the minds of a large segment of the common people of New England.⁶

Much in the same vein is Louis Hacker's treatment of the Reverend Jonathan Mayhew's sermon, "A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission," delivered in Boston in 1750. Here again the tremendous change in the conception of authority in the New England mind is shown when Mayhew contends that only those who are actually not "a terror to good works, but to the evil," should be qualified to rule, and that the subjects of Charles I had possessed a perfect right to rebel against their sovereign's misuse of power. As Hacker suggests, there is a marked similarity between Mayhew's arguments and those of the Declaration of Independence; and the sermon thus forms part of the intellectual background of the American Revolution.⁷

The use of the Edwards and Mayhew speeches by historians Miller and Hacker points up a deep underlying current of resistance to authority in the colonial mind which casts considerable illumination upon the origins of the struggle for independence. Without a substantial weakening of the older concepts of authority, traditional loyalty to the throne might well have frustrated any attempt by a Sam Adams or a Tom Paine to arouse the American people. This is but one example of the rewards which a study of contemporary rhetoric has given to those who have used it as a fertile source for intellectual history.

MICROCOSM OF PUBLIC OPINION

Historians, however, need not limit their study of public address to a search for finished products in the form of classical statements of generative

⁴ Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945), pp. 16-17; Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1954), *passim*, especially chapters V, X, XII; Paul W. Gates, "The Forty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. LXI, No. 2, (September, 1954), pp. 304-305; Merle Curti, "Intellectuals and Other People," in *The American Historical Review*, Vol. LX, No. 2, (January, 1955), pp. 262-263, 269, 277.

⁵ Lawrence Henry Mouat, *A Guide to Effective Public Speaking*, (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953), p. 65.

⁶ Perry Miller, "The Puritans and Democracy," in Courtlandt Canby and Nancy E. Gross, *The World of History*, (New York: The New American Library, 1954), pp. 83-98.

⁷ Louis M. Hacker, *The Shaping of the American Tradition*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), Vol. I, pp. 114-119.

ideas; by keen analysis several scholars have been able to find in a survey of contemporary oratory the raw materials which in polished form become the over-riding sentiments of an era.⁸ Rhetoric in this sense is used as a microcosm of public opinion.

Marvin Meyers, of the University of Chicago, has very cogently demonstrated this particular use of public address in a recent article which seeks to ascertain the precise nature of the popular appeal of Jacksonianism. According to this social scientist, historians in many cases have a tendency to become so preoccupied with the various institutional changes which transpired during the Jackson period that they lose sight of what the average citizen of that time was really thinking about. "If a certain set of precise legal institutional changes were the major consequences of Jacksonian reform," asks Meyers, "what is the meaning of the highly-charged political jargon, the vague class appeals, the invocation of grand principles? Why, in short, did the language go so far beyond the practical object?"

To the rhetorician, this question is pertinent in the extreme. Is it not of some worth to gain an index as to what the "man in the street" thought "Jacksonianism" really was, or, as Meyers puts it, "to identify the social values expressed or implied by opinion leaders of the Jacksonian persuasion"? After subjecting a series of public statements by Jackson himself to close analysis, Meyers concludes that, to the average citizen of the time, "Jacksonianism" implied a return to plainness, honesty, simplicity, frugal government, and stable economy. Its essence was therefore reactionary rather than progressive; it stressed a return to Jeffersonian principles rather than an advance toward a "new creation." In this manner an effort is made to cut through the institutional history of a period to the basic and most prevalent popular mood through an analysis of rhetoric.⁹

This same approach is used in Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager's ever-popular text, *The Growth of the American Republic*, in which the authors point up the prevailing popular mood toward the Democratic Party in the North follow-

ing the Civil War by quoting from one of Robert Ingersoll's "bloody shirt" speeches:

"Every State that seceded from the Union was a Democratic State. . . Every man that endeavored to tear the old flag from the heaven it enriches was a Democrat. . . The man that assassinated Abraham Lincoln was a Democrat. . . Soldiers, every scar you have on your heroic bodies was given you by a Democrat."¹⁰

Statesmen and politicians may work for fixed institutional changes, but they carry on their activities within a framework of public opinion. Recent historiography thus suggests that the use of rhetoric may be very valuable as a means of isolating the popular moods which are both determinants and products of the actions of public leaders.

INFORMATION OR FORCE?

If a study of rhetoric may be used to good effect by the historian in helping to clarify and pin-point the forces which are at work in a given period or setting, is this all that it is good for? Is rhetoric merely a gold mine of *information* for scholars, or can public address be studied also as a *vital force* in its own right in man's march through time and space? It must at the outset be granted that it is extremely difficult to determine the *precise* impact upon the stream of human development of any piece of oral discourse; yet one does not have to limit himself to a study of the all-time oratorical "greats" to realize that this impact is very real. The average historian's attempt to discern in "tangible" (material) forces the cause for various important occurrences is only natural; but it has resulted in an unfortunate situation in which good historical analysis of the electrifying though partially indeterminate consequences of great speeches are comparatively rare.

One such analysis, however, is to be found in Claude Bower's description of the short-range impact of the Webster-Hayne debate. At the beginning of this congressional skirmish, the forces of the South and West had been arrayed against the Northeast over the issue of the sale of western lands. Since eastern capitalists wished to choke off these sales in order to keep skilled labor along the seaboard, the South saw a good opportunity to defend the cause of the West and thus win a

⁸ See, R. T. Oliver, "Living Words," and "The Speech that Established Roosevelt's Reputation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, February, 1943, pp. 19-22, and October, 1945, pp. 274-282.

⁹ Marvin Meyers, "The Jacksonian Persuasion," in *American Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 1, (Spring, 1953), pp. 3-15.

¹⁰ Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 3rd ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), Vol. II, p. 8.

valuable ally in the sectional dispute. When Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina accordingly unleashed a fierce attack upon the arch-symbol of the eastern business interests, Daniel Webster, westerners nodded approvingly.

Hayne's good sense as a debater, however, was not as sharp as the fundamental strategy of the South. Instead of dwelling strictly upon the land issue, he strayed into a defense of John C. Calhoun's theory of nullification. Realizing that the West was staunchly unionist, Webster perceived his opportunity to split the opposition; and the New England orator cunningly drove the wedge of lurking southern disunionism between Hayne and his would-be western allies. *One rhetorician's mistake and another's genius had turned a corner in American history*; even Andrew Jackson, well-disposed to Hayne at the beginning of the debate, turned his back upon the southern cohorts.¹¹

Another instance of the direct influence of rhetoric upon the historical process is brilliantly developed in Allan Nevins's description of the congressional defeat of the Lecompton Constitution of 1857. This document, which attempted to foist an unwanted pro-slavery government upon the inhabitants of Kansas Territory, seemed sure to pass Congress because of the influence exerted in its behalf by President James Buchanan and his closest advisers. Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, however, perceived a way to defeat the pro-southern scheme; his strategy involved delaying the congressional vote until public oratory and polemic literature worked up sufficient anti-slavery pressure upon northern representatives to defeat the bill in the vote-conscious lower house. Although the ill-designed constitution passed the Senate, Douglas was successful; public pressure caused the defeat of the scheme in the House of Representatives. Anti-slavery rhetoric had won a

fight of considerable importance in the fight against the South's "peculiar institution."¹²

To find the roots of certain historical occurrences in the powers exerted by public persuasion need not be too difficult for a generation of historians whose world has been to a large degree shaped by propaganda of one sort or another. Through the mere observance of current events by scholars, if through no other medium, the use of rhetoric as a force in human events capable of producing verifiable results should be augmented in future years.

In summation, many recent students of history are paying more respect to rhetoric as a source and force than was accorded to it at an earlier date. Because of the peculiar nature of the speech-making situation itself as a breeding-ground for the enunciation of classic statements of great ideas, the records of public address form a vital source for the intellectual historian. Oral persuasion frequently mirrors the prevalent popular moods of the historical periods in which it is employed, and thus serves as a microcosm of public opinion. The role of public speaking as a concrete force with tremendous impact upon the historical process is being increasingly recognized.

The situation is not yet everything that the professional speech scholar might wish; but such scholars must recognize a trend in the right direction reflected in Isaac Deutscher's tribute to speech in his recent study of Leon Trotsky and the Russian Revolution:

"... in this revolution words, great idealistic words, were in fact more effective than regiments and divisions, and inspired tirades did the work of pitched battles . . . The revolution worked mainly through its titanic power of persuasion."¹³

¹¹ Claude Bowers, *The Party Battles of the Jackson Period*, (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922), pp. 92-103.

¹² Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Lincoln*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), Vol. I, pp. 261-264, 295.

¹³ Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 306.

Other Available Means of Persuasion — —

Edited by J. Calvin Callaghan

Dr. Callaghan, Chairman of Public Address at Syracuse University, whose excellent paper, "Are We Really Teaching Them to Communicate," appeared in TODAY'S SPEECH for September, 1955, edits a series of three articles on modern trends in the theory of persuasion. In them Mr. Angell, Instructor of English, Princeton University, Dr. Ness, Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin, and Dr. Smith, Assistant Professor of Speech at Syracuse, examine contributions to persuasion from philosophy, social psychology, and literary criticism.

In an editorial in the October issue of *Today's Speech* in 1953 (Vol. I, No. 2, p. 1) appeared the following provocative paragraph:

Aristotle's injunction to utilize "all available means of persuasion" reminds us to look beyond the obvious factors in the speaker-audience-situation continuum. The Gestalt psychologists, Kurt Lewin's "field theory," group dynamics, Coutu's "tinsit" concept, Vaihinger's "As-If" philosophy, Kenneth Burke's "new rhetoric," Mead's "I-me" concept, Dewey's "emphasis upon habits", and other relevant findings by social psychologists invite our attention to factors unavailable to traditional rhetoricians.

This invitation to investigation was accepted in New York City on April 2, 1955, at the annual convention of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. In a symposium-forum this assertion, that there may exist in our twentieth-century world "available means of persuasion" unknown to Aristotle and the classical rhetoricians, was subject to scrutiny from three points of view.

Probing the discipline of philosophy, Mr. Angell elected to assess the potential contribution to rhetoric of the coherence theory of truth. Searching the discipline of social psychology, Mr. Ness ex-

amined the contribution of concepts evolved by George Herbert Mead. Exploring the discipline of literary criticism, Mr. Smith evaluated the contributions of Kenneth Burke. Condensed here for *Today's Speech* are reports of their findings and their judgments.

Although even in summation these three reports in no way constitute a definitive test of the editorial assertions, at least three inferences may be tentatively essayed:

1. A renewed confidence in classical rhetoric is in order: it withstands well both the test of time and the onslaughts of current critical analysis.
2. In rhetoric, as in the life it mirrors, there probably is very little new under the sun. But every generation of rhetoricians must rediscover for itself the validity of old truths; when these are newly integrated, or their components newly structured, old truths become in a sense new; and the new may be more significantly applicative than the old to one's own age.
3. The editorial contention is valid: in modern disciplines tangent to rhetoric there are available "other" means of persuasion. These should be studied, and they should be used.

From the Discipline of Philosophy — By Clarence S. Angell

The title of this paper might lead one to suspect that the author was about to trespass on the private domain of the professional philosophers. However, Quintilian remarked that "the objection that to discourse on what is good, expedient, or just is the duty of philosophy presents no difficulty . . . since I have already shown in the first book that philosophers only usurped this department

of knowledge after it had been abandoned by the orators; it was always the peculiar property of rhetoric and the philosophers are really trespassers." A liberal construction of this passage may justify my attempt. It is not, after all, an invasion of another's domain, but merely an attempt to reclaim the ancestral estate of the rhetorician.

I hope to present a greatly simplified exposition

of the theory itself, to allude to other authors who have made some applications of it to general argumentative methods, and to suggest that the theory provides a philosophical framework so congenial to the study of rhetoric that it can be the basis for integrating several particular rhetorical concepts with which we are all familiar.

The coherence theory of truth is a concept taken from the Idealistic school of philosophy. The elaboration of this theory is dependent on two postulates, which must be stated and explained before the theory itself can be presented in a workable form. In fact, when the second postulate is fully understood, the theory is almost apparent without further explanation.

The first postulate is the affirmation of the possibility of knowledge. Negatively stated, it amounts to the rejection of the extreme skeptical position, which school denied the possibility of knowledge of things outside our own minds. As rhetoricians, I trust that few of us will object to this first postulation. If we deny the possibility of knowledge, we preclude the possibility of communication, and this would speedily put us out of business.

The second postulate is in the form of an absolute. This absolute represents the ultimate reality as an organic whole; a perfectly structured propositional universe which contains no contradictions, no incongruities. The idealist nature of this absolute is apparent, for it is more of an intellectual construct than an object of the senses. This ultimately is simply the absence of contradiction, and the reign of perfect consistency. Reason, in the light of this concept, is not only the means of investigating reality; it is the very constituent principle of reality. All members of this kind of a universe are disposed in perfect harmony, and the whole of which they are parts is such an integral whole that no part could be other than it is without destroying the whole itself.

An analogy involving a physical structure will serve to render this abstract concept more readily comprehensible. In this analogy, the physical structure is the analogy of the absolute reality which I have described, and the various observations I shall make about the elements of this structure have their analogues in the characteristics of the elements of the propositional universe I have described. The several operations I shall

TAPE RECORDERS

At least 10% discount on any make

SCOTCH RECORDING TAPE

4 - 6 reels - 15% off list

7 - 12 reels - 20% off list

13 - 24 reels - 25% off list

over 24 reels - 30% off list

Unusual SPEECH, POETRY and
THEATRE L. P. RECORDS

A COMPLETE LINE OF
THEATRICAL STAGE SUPPLIES

FREE CATALOG
TO SCHOOLS & DIRECTORS

PARAMOUNT
Cosmetics & Theatrical Make-Up

242 W. 27 St., N. Y. 1, N. Y.

P. B. RAWLEY

DISTRIBUTOR

A D C AUDIOMETERS

Speech Recording
and
Associated Equipment

Complete Laboratory
Service

Including Recalibration
with Ultra-Precision
Artificial Ear

177 Fairview Avenue

Rutherford, N. J.

Phone: Geneva 8-0299

propose to be performed on this structure have their analogues in the processes of proof, disproof, and inference.

A visiting professor of design at Princeton University, Mr. Buckminster Fuller, directed his students in the construction of what he called a "discontinuous compression sphere". This sphere was constructed of rods and cables in such a manner that the rods were not bolted, welded, nor riveted together. They were held in place by the cables, all of which were installed and adjusted as to tension with great exactness. The rods were thus held in place and the shape of a sphere maintained, by the precise balance and opposition of tensions of these cables. The complicated nature of this structure is by now probably painfully evident. It is not necessary, however, to know in detail just how the elements are disposed, nor how they were installed in the process of construction, in order to see the significance of this structure as an analogue to the ultimate reality; for its essence is not so much the physical elements composing it, as the relationships among them, and the essential "oneness" of the structure. It could not exist in part: a part would be a mass of bars and cables without any constituent principle whatever. Each element has one and only one place.

Furthermore, the absence of any member, or its inappropriate position would destroy the whole structure, just as any proposition which does not occupy its correct position in the propositional universe must either be declared false (eliminated) or, if it is affirmed, the whole of the universe of knowledge must be denied.

Should we decide that one bar or cable would be better after we moved it, and try to make such a change, we should either deform the bar or destroy the sphere. Just so in the propositional universe: if we dislike a truth, and attempt to eliminate it or to move it, we either destroy the whole of our universe of knowledge or deform the truth. Argumentatively speaking, a proposition is defended by pointing out that it must be so, or else all other knowledge is denied. This method has been variously termed "this or nothing" method, and the "natural" method, and the "chaos is come again" method. This application of the coherence theory of truth to argumentative method has been developed by Bernard Bosanquet* in his book *Implication and Linear Inference* and by professor Herbert Wichelns and

Gladys Graham in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

"Truth," in this system, is the quality of fitting harmoniously into the whole structure of reality. It is congruence with reality. We must remember, however, that in the system we are discussing, reality itself is a mental, or idealist, concept, namely the absence of contradiction. Hence truth is the state of not being the source of incongruity or contradiction. "Proof" is the process by which we demonstrate this congruence with reality. "Disproof," conversely, is the process by which we demonstrate that a proposition is not congruent with the whole of reality; that, if it is maintained, it introduces a contradiction which denies the whole of our system of knowledge.

We can learn still more about our methods of making inferences by further inspection of this sphere. Should we decide to alter the position of any member while at the same time maintaining the integrity of the whole sphere, it would be necessary to make simultaneous compensatory adjustments of all other members in order to compensate for the distortion we should have introduced. It would be difficult, though theoretically possible, to compute all such compensatory adjustments. To do so sequentially would be complicated and practically endless, like a dog chasing its tail; and would correspond to a process of reasoning (either inductive or deductive) in which the inference is linear. To do so radially (if this were possible) would be quicker and simpler, and would correspond to a reasoning process which Bosanquet calls "implication," in which the inference is not linear, but is mediated in all directions from the proposition in question to all other parts of the whole.

I shall conclude by pointing out the correlation between the coherence theory of truth and Plato's system of rhetoric as presented in the "Phaedrus". The coherence theory of truth matches Plato's rhetorical formulations on both the metaphysical and the operational plane. The basic requirement for a rhetorician, in Plato's system, is to know the truth. He believed that all mortals, in a prior existence as pure spirits, saw and understood the

* Bosanquet, writing on a practical rather than metaphysical level, speaks of "complexes" by which he means certain segments of reality, segments small enough to be handled, and which exhibit the same qualities of "oneness" and "relatedness" exhibited by the total or ultimate reality discussed in this paper. The process of inference is the same, however, in either case.

whole truth. As finite human beings, our knowledge of this perfect truth is abridged and dimmed. However, some memory of it remains in our minds. Should this memory be revived, and should the relationship between a particular proposition and this perfect truth be made clear, our minds would be irresistibly drawn to the proposition because of its agreement with the revived awareness of the perfect truth.

This perfect and whole truth corresponds to the universal absolute in the coherence theory. The function of the rhetorician is, through the medium of language, to reawaken our knowledge of this truth (in terms of the coherence theory, to sharpen our awareness of the structured nature of reality, of its "relatedness") and to demonstrate the congruity of a particular proposition with this perfect reality. Plato further outlines a theory of classes of souls, and describes how each class may most effectively be made aware of the truth. In other words, he gives us a plan for analyzing our audiences to discover how they may most effectively be made aware of the nature of truth, and of the relationship between it and the particular proposition we wish them to accept.

It is of course true that in neither the physical analogue, if it were large enough to be a perfect analogue of the propositional universe; nor in Plato's rhetoric, if by the truth we mean the whole and complete truth apprehended only by disembodied spirits, can anyone know the whole truth.

We are compelled to deal with segments of it. These segments, or "complexes," as Bosanquet calls them, are manageable units. The rhetorician can be expected to know the truth as it is embodied in any one nexus or complex; he can actually make his audience aware of the related nature of the elements of complex; and he can then demonstrate that to reject his favored proposition would require the destruction of that complex.

The correspondences between the coherence theory of truth and the elements of Aristotle's system of rhetoric, more especially between the theory and his concepts of the enthymeme, the concepts of the *ratio essendi* and the *ratio cognoscendi*, are interesting areas to investigate. Perhaps at some time when I have not spent so much time playing with my oversize erector set, I may attempt to examine these correspondences.

REFERENCES

- 1 Quintilian *Institutes of Oratory*
Book II chapter XXI p. 361
Loeb Classical Library edition
- 2 Bosanquet, Bernard, *Implications and Linear Inference*
MacMillan & Co. London 1920
especially chapters 1 & 2
- 3 Graham, Gladys Murphy "Logic of Argumentation"
Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 10, pp. 350-263
- 4 Wichelns, Herbert A. "Analysis and Synthesis in Argumentation"
Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 11, pp. 266-272
- 5 Graham, Gladys Murphy "The Natural Procedure in Argument"
Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 11, pp. 319-337

From the Discipline of Social Psychology *By Ordean G. Ness*

Social psychology offers much which appeals to a student of speech. It is a discipline which tries to posit an integrated analysis of what happens in social interaction and why it happens that way in that situation. Included in its purview — indeed, at the nucleus of its purview — is the function of *communication* in social interaction.

As has been the case in many of the social sciences, the early history of social psychology was marked by a number of varied currents of thought. But in the last two decades the field has stabilized considerably. Perhaps the most valuable and comprehensive theoretical contribution has been that made by George Mead in the 1920's and 1930's.

At that time the "behaviorists," led by John Watson, were crystallizing their approach to the problems of human behavior. In a very real sense,

Mead was one of these. But for him there were several fundamental questions which remained unanswered by this philosophy. He could not find, in the laboratory experiments of the behaviorists, the answer to how a selfconscious, reflective mind develops in a human being. He could not find, in the reflect-arc or simple stimulus-response concept, an adequate explanation for the diversities of human conduct, and particularly for the private experience of thought and rationality. His purposive study led him to recognize that one essential factor was lacking in this individualistic and sterile laboratory approach — the factor of society. Mead visualized the individual act functioning only within the social act. Although he himself did not use the term, his philosophy has frequently been labeled "Social Behaviorism."

One of the basic concepts of this "social behav-

iorism" is Mead's analysis of the genesis of personality. Mead held, as do most social scientists today, that a newborn child possesses no "personality" as such. The infant is an unorganized being with biological impulses and needs, but no determinate behavior. During socialization there gradually emerges from this being the phenomenon which Mead calls the "self." It is in terms of this "self" that personality takes shape and the mind begins to function.

The "self" is formed only through contact and communication with other human beings. Communication is the imperative of the process. At first, contact is simply physical. For example, the infant's constantly recurring hunger needs are satisfied by his mother or nurse. Because these attendants show a certain regularity in ministering to these needs, the child soon establishes habitual patterns of behavior. Such habits, however, are not the integral basis of personality.

During the second year, the child starts performing quite distinguishable imitative acts. For a brief moment he copies the actions of his mother or his nurse. He seems to put himself into the position of the other person and tries to act like her. He "takes the role" of the "other." Later this *role-taking* becomes more meaningful. The child now acts toward himself when he assumes the role of the "other." He no longer simply imitates his mother; he now acts toward himself as he has visualized his mother acting toward him. This is when the "self" first takes shape; for the unique characteristic of the "self" is its reflective nature. It can be both subject and object to itself. It can reflect upon itself.

At first, the child takes on these separate and discrete roles of others one at a time. When he does so, he seems to step outside himself physically. Soon, however, he learns to internalize these roles. He no longer vocalizes his mother's "Don't do that, Bobby" as he contemplates upsetting the goldfish bowl. Now he seems able, as it were, to think out his mother's attitude about the goldfish bowl and to control himself accordingly without overtly acting out his mother's warning.

In the final stage, the child takes the roles of a number of other persons into his action and thought at once, and starts to develop a "unified self." This results from such experiences as participating in organized games. Mead, using baseball as his example, points out that the child must have the responses of each position in his own position. The first baseman, for instance, must know what

to expect from everyone else on the field in order to carry out his own play.

The child also belongs to other groups which show a certain regularity and organization. He learns to assume the roles of the others who belong to these groups. In addition, he is a member of an organized community. When the roles and attitudes of this community take shape within the "self," a process of generalization occurs. What earlier were the attitudes of individual "others" now become the attitudes of "everybody" in a given situation. This Mead calls the "generalized other"; some have translated it loosely as "social conscience." It is through the generalized other that society implants in the individual the mores and folkways which regulate human conduct so that society can survive. When a person takes on this system of mutually held community attitudes, he becomes a complete "self." He is then a social being in the fullest sense.

The process never ends so long as communication with others takes place. From time to time the individual joins new social groups, organized or unorganized, in which he must take on a new role. Vicariously, through literature, the theatre, radio, television, the daily newspaper, and other media of mass communication, he learns additional roles. Any of these, of course, is learned only in relation to those already integrated into the "self." Because of this, no single human personality can be duplicated in another person.

However, the "self," as conceived by Mead, is not simply a system of general and specific roles of others which we have reorganized into our own. If it were, there would be no accounting for the dynamic aspect of personality. We are not merely static reflections of the society within which we interact; to a greater or lesser extent we also help determine that society.

To explain this, Mead introduces the dual concept of the "I" and the "me." The "me" consists of the roles and the accompanying attitudes we have taken over from our parents, our playmates, our teachers and others, and from imaginary characters of literature and fantasy. But when we act in one of these roles, we do not simply duplicate the act of the "other." Something is added or changed. This is the result of the functioning of the "I," the dynamic actor.

We know the "I" only in memory, says Mead. It acts only in the present and cannot be caught except in retrospect. Because of this, we cannot entirely predict how the "I" will respond to the

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF
**SPEECH
AND
DRAMATIC
ARTS**

COURSES OFFERED IN:
Public Address and
Rhetoric
Speech Correction and
Audiology
Theatre
Radio and Television
Speech Education

Graduate and
Undergraduate
degree programs.

ACTIVITIES
Debate Council
Speakers Bureau
Speech and Hearing Clinic
University Theatre
Radio Workshop
Television Workshop

Graduate Assistantships
available

ADDRESS: Chairman, Department
of Speech and Dramatic Arts
**TEMPLE
UNIVERSITY**
Philadelphia 22, Pa.

"me." We may know, or think we know, the attitude a particular person holds toward us because we have observed tendencies in his previous responses. But we cannot be absolutely sure that his response will follow those tendencies in a new situation. There exists in each of us a certain degree of predictability; in automatic reactions the "I" shows real stability. But when choice of response is possible, there is always an uncertain element in human behavior.

In summary, then, social psychology now conceives human personality and human conduct primarily as products of social-cultural experience. It does not ignore physiological needs and urges as functions of that personality, but it has been found that the manner in which these needs are satisfied is actually learned through the role-taking process. Above all, human personality is a dynamic phenomenon revealing variations, not only between individuals, but within the same individual in different situations.

What does this concept of the formation of personality mean to the student of speech who is searching for the available means of communication and persuasion? Out of many possible implications, let us examine three meanings in the area of audience adaptation — so often the crux of success or failure in communicative endeavor.

First, audience adaptation seems to be primarily the product of the speaker's personality. A communicator succeeds only to the extent to which he can build up a useful image of the person with whom he is communicating. To do this he must try to put himself into the "role of the other," in order to know what to expect in the behavior of the other. Such transcendence is possible only if the other's role has been made, or can be made, a role of the speaker's own personality. Success in many situations, then, depends largely on the number of roles the speaker has adequately integrated into his own personality which he can recognize in the individuals with whom he is communicating. This concept of speaker-audience interaction serves to reinforce the enduring philosophy of rhetoricians that training of the speaker must be training of the whole man.

A second consequent of Mead's theory must also be the realization that there can be no one patent formula for success in audience adaptation. For example, a speaker cannot rely too heavily on any all-embracing list of human "motives" as the basis of emotional proof. The mode of "emotional" response appears to result from

learning. If so, it is subject to all the variations inherent in learning. A speaker cannot depend on any arbitrary set of rules for gaining and holding attention. Attention is a function of the entire physiological-psychological "set" of the individual in a particular social context at a particular time. It is governed by such complex determinants as self-interest, culture, internal conditions, emotion, familiarity, previous experience, emphasis, expectancy, goals, values. All of these relate directly to the integrated role structure of the self. Mead's concept of the interaction of "I" and "me" in individual behavior suggests also that, even though we feel that we thoroughly understand the person to whom we are talking, we cannot always predict the choice of responses he may make to us and our ideas.

Nor can a speaker accept any metaphysical theory of group behavior as a short-cut to audience analysis. The concept of the "crowd" mind popular before the turn of the century has no general acceptance now. A member of a crowd or audience maintains his entity as an individual human personality. His behavior may be altered because of the presence of others. But it is because he takes a particular role in relation to them and to the situation, not because he gives up his own identity to the group identity.

In short, as students of Speech, we cannot dupe ourselves into believing that there exists a single panacea for all our communicative needs. We must be as much concerned in discovering the complexities and barriers of communication as in learning "devices" to secure a desired response.

Third, while no one method of audience analysis seems to meet these complexities, social psychologists frequently do suggest that knowing a person's group memberships can give a significant preliminary insight into his behavior. Many of the roles of our personalities have a group context. In part at least, all members of a group share a particular pattern of thinking and acting. The more we learn about a person's group membership, the more we can learn about his past and expected behavior.

Of course, each of us belongs to many groups, some formal, many more informal. Each group role is colored by all our other roles. And at any particular moment these roles will assume some system of hierarchy where one or more may come

into ascendancy. This hierarchy constantly changes from situation to situation. So even though we concentrate on group memberships as a basis for audience analysis, we cannot think of it as an easy way out. Knowing a person's affiliations is only the first step. We must also know what that affiliation means in terms of attitudes, needs, and behavior. And we must recognize that group attitudes are constantly in flux because of the dynamics of the human personalities which compose the group.

Each individual possesses a different set of group memberships. Therefore, adjustment to each person in an audience of any size is impossible. The speaker's initial task, then, seems to be to determine as precisely as he can the homogeneity of group memberships within his audience. George Gallup suggests that the most significant conditioners of attitude are occupational groups, sex, age, place of residence, political preference, income level, educational level, race, and religion. These can serve as a starting place for the speaker's analysis — but only as a starting place.

The speaker must also determine which of these — or any other group role — tends to play the most important part in behavior control at the particular moment. Analysis of the occasion, the specific situation, and the events leading up to the situation must be related and combined with the analysis of group roles.

These are certainly not the only meanings that we, as speech students, can derive from George Mead's thinking. Nor are they presented here as novel concepts. Recognition of the intricacies and problems of communication has existed as long as scholars have written on rhetoric.

But Mead's contribution to Speech goes beyond mere recognition. He has portrayed the whole phenomenon of human behavior as based upon, and carried out through, the process of communication — which, after all, is our principal concern. He has pin-pointed for us a rationale as to how communication barriers arise and how they operate in practical situations. As a result, it would seem that his concept of "mind, self, and society" is a very useful and usable point of departure in our search for a sound orientation to effective communication, and to audience adaptation in particular.

From the Discipline of Literary Criticism *By Charles Daniel Smith*

There is little doubt among literary critics that Kenneth Burke is one of the most brilliant and suggestive of modern speculative thinkers. As valuable as is his contribution to the field of literary criticism, however, there is some doubt that the insights provided by his "new rhetoric" will reveal anything really new.

The most serious charge against Burke is that he has rendered the term "rhetoric" so all-inclusive as to make it almost meaningless. As Donald C. Bryant remarked in 1953, "In the 'new rhetoric' of Kenneth Burke, the utmost extension rather than practical limit-setting is the aim."¹ Marie Hochmuth, on the other hand, thinks that Burke does give rhetoric, as she puts it, "a defining value in terms of persuasion, identification, and address or communication to an audience of some sort."²

There is no necessary difference in the apparently opposing points of view expressed by competent people about Burke's position. The fact is that he is a highly abstruse writer who is badly in need of an editor, a writer who confronts even his most sophisticated readers with insurmountable semantic difficulties. How much *does* Burke intend to limit his terms when he writes, for instance, "Wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric. And wherever there is 'meaning' there is 'persuasion'?" Since he does not provide us with a glossary of the terms he characteristically encloses with quotation marks—with the intention, apparently, of giving them special meanings—there is no way of learning those meanings except through conversation with him, an avenue not accessible to most of his readers. Until translators come along who can render Burke authoritatively into language that at least the advanced reader can understand, differences of opinion about what he intends to say will continue.

Such people are beginning to appear. Marie Hochmuth's article, "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric'"³ suggests the broad outlines of his work and Virginia Holland's doctoral thesis, accepted at the University of Illinois in 1954, investigates the Aristotelianism in Burke's rhetorical theory and makes a start in the direction of determining whether he has contributed significantly to rhetorical theory generally. Special weight should be given to the findings of Hochmuth and

Holland, not only for the excellence of their analyses, but also because both have had extensive conversations with Burke and he has approved what they have written.

The most important of Burke's rhetorical concepts is one which has several elements in common with Mead's "I-me" concept in the field of social psychology. Burke's key term is "identification." People are susceptible to persuasion because of their need to identify their attitudes with the attitudes of others, possibly because it is a means of feeling important. A baseball fan, for instance, identifies himself with his favorite team and experiences feelings of pride when they win and shame when they lose, even though he had nothing to do with their winning or losing. It is basically important to all of us that we identify ourselves with others. We develop mental associations, often unconsciously, in common with those whom we admire—toward objects, organizations, and ideas.

Toward any object with which we identify ourselves — let's say, for instance, an old high school gymnasium — each member of an audience will have a cluster of attitudes ranging from highly favorable to decidedly unfavorable. When a speaker weighs the elements of persuasion inherent in the audience's attitudes toward the gymnasium, he selects only those that will evoke the pattern of experience he desires to recall to their minds. If he favors replacing the old gym with a large new one, he will emphasize the unsafe, crowded bleachers, the poor ventilation, the substandard playing court, etc., and he can be persuasive only if he succeeds in identifying his own predominant attitude with those attitudes which already exist in the minds of his audience. Another speaker, on the other hand, might argue against replacing the old gym. He would select arguments emphasizing the camaraderie and pleasant memories. He, too, would be identifying his own predominant attitudes with those which already exist in the minds of his audience. It is because of this possibility of identifying the speaker's attitude with one of a large number of attitudes—some of them diametrically opposed, all held in the same cluster by members of an audience—that rhetoric can be said to prove opposites.

All this, it seems to me, is remarkably similar to what Ordean Ness has written concerning the Mead concept in social psychology:

A communicator succeeds only to the extent to which he can build up a useful image of the individual with whom he is communicating. . . . Success . . . depends largely upon the number of roles which the speaker has adequately integrated into his own personality which he can recognize in the individuals with whom he is communicating.⁴

Burke calls this a strategy of identification. Let's consider whether it can give the rhetorical critic any fresh insights into what a speaker is doing when he persuades.

All of us have probably used the Aristotelian categories of proof in attempting to assess the effectiveness of any given speech, and all of us have probably discovered that they are unwieldy because they are not mutually exclusive. They are like molten metals poured together to form an alloy. It would be difficult, in such a case, to say how much of the strength of the new metal is due to each of its components. It is even more difficult to separate out of the logical, ethical, and pathetic elements of any proof because none has ever had any separate existence. When, for instance, a man says to his wife, "I think we ought to buy a bond a month because if we do, we'll be putting something by for our old age," — and she agrees with him — how much of her acceptance of the idea comes from its logic, how much from her faith in her husband's wisdom, and how much from her desire for security? Burke would ask rather what strategy of identification is being employed. In this instance, it is fairly clear that the husband succeeded in identifying his own attitude toward security with an attitude already held by his wife.

The concept of identification is, of course, not new in rhetorical theory. Holland believes that it is implicit in Aristotle's three categories of proof. It has been stated in modern times by Winans and others as "common ground." No critic

before Burke, however, has considered that identification is the keystone idea in a philosophy of persuasion, and the emphasis that he has given this concept may well be his major contribution to modern rhetorical theory.

Perhaps, as teachers of public address, we might experiment in finding better ways of teaching our students how to analyze their audiences. Robert T. Oliver outlined one method in his *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, first published in 1942. He suggested that each student tell the other members of the class what his group loyalties are, which ones he thinks he holds in common with other members of the class, through which ones a speaker might make the most effective appeal to him. This is not easy for the student to do, of course, because many of his important identifications are unconscious. Imperfectly as we do this sort of thing now, it can give our students an increased appreciation of the multiplicity of attitudes that exist in every audience. Perhaps we can discover ways of doing it better than we now do.

"In recognizing man explaining as well as man persuading," says Karl Wallace, "modern rhetoric has added significantly to its territory."⁵ Burke, strangely, excludes exposition from the field of rhetoric and merely draws the implication that any description or exposition that a speaker makes in order to clarify his position "has rhetoric in it" but is not synonymous with rhetoric. It seems that Burke has missed his greatest opportunity, thus far, by failing to turn his mind to a philosophy of exposition.

Although Burke's system is still classical in its essentials, he does provide us with a new and fresh way of looking at persuasive discourse.

REFERENCES

- ¹ "Rhetoric: Its Functions and its Scope," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (December, 1953), p. 405.
- ² "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (April, 1952), p. 405.
- ³ *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (April, 1952).
- ⁴ *Supra*, p. 31.
- ⁵ "The Field of Speech, 1953: An Overview," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (April, 1954), p. 119.

Recently Published!

SPEECH CORRECTION THROUGH STORY-TELLING UNITS

A Manual for the Classroom Teacher

By Elizabeth McGinley Nemoy

The classroom teacher will find in this excellent book long needed help in aiding the child to grow in the power to express his thoughts adequately in oral form. Developments in modern science—the radio, television, the airplane, the atomic bomb—have made this air age a speaking age as well, and efficiency in oral expression occupies a place of major importance in the well designed curriculum.

Mrs. Nemoy, Teacher of Speech Correction in the Philadelphia Public Schools, and Co-author of "The Correction of Defective Consonant Sounds" has given outstanding service as a regular classroom teacher, in teacher training in the field of Speech Correction, and in assisting the elementary and secondary teacher in finding means of improving speech in the regular classroom through group instruction. The simple, practical nature of the materials and approaches presented in this new book are the results of this rich background of experience.

THE STORY APPROACH and the content of the stories reveal a deep understanding of the basic drives and interests of children. THE SELF-TRAINING ASPECT OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES demonstrates an equal appreciation of the teacher untrained in the field of phonetics or speech correction. The value of the material is not restricted, however, to use by the classroom teacher. THE SPEECH CORRECTIONIST will find it a source of great MOTIVATION to the child, and a challenge to herself.

- CONTENTS: PART 1. Introduction
2. How the Consonant Sounds are Produced
 3. Order of Presentation of Consonant Sounds
 4. How to Use the Book

Part II. The Sound-Stories and Instructional Material

Each sound-story is preceded by Instructions to the teacher, including Description of Sound, Common Errors and How to Correct Them, and Suggestions to the Teacher.

The sound-stories cover the following sounds:

H, P, B, M, WH, W, F, V, Th (voiceless), Th (voiced),
T, D, N, K, G, NG, Y, L, R, S, Z, SH, ZH, CH, J.

The author provides in this new book corrective procedures as ear-training, conscious imitation of sound, classification through analogy, and contrast of one sound with another. The sound-stories contain original jingles as an integral part of the story—stories which also give corrective procedures and a classification of speech sounds which shows their major characteristics, and an analytic description of the sound will be found in a section preceding each story.

(283 pp. cloth bound) \$3.75

EXPRESSION COMPANY

Magnolia

Massachusetts

Outstanding **McGRAW-HILL** Books

ORAL COMMUNICATION IN BUSINESS

By DAVID C. PHILLIPS, University of Connecticut 240 pages, \$3.75

A practical, how-to-do-it approach to effective oral communication—particularly in business. Relatively brief, compact, and concentrated, the book is a keen-edged workable tool for executives and trainees. It is designed to assist the individual, the group, or an entire company in presenting new ideas, bettering personal relations, holding better conferences, getting more effective reports, conducting better interviews, and making more effective use of oral communication channels. The first part of the book stresses essential principles basic to all situations. The remainder treats the specific situations such as conference, interview, sales, running a meeting, and radio and television presentations.

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPEECH

By DAVID GUY POWERS, Queens College. *McGraw-Hill Series in Speech*. 380 pages, \$4.25

An outstanding book which develops essential skills through directed practice in a variety of practical speech situations, and furnishes the basic knowledge necessary for intelligent speech improvement. It combines training in the four speech skills — social, semantic, vocal, and phonetic — with public speaking, discussion, and the speech arts. It offers a definitely active program, emphasizing the need for the student's participation and critical analysis, both of himself and of others. Through developing skill in word usage, voice, articulation, and social sensitivity, it seeks to weld an expressive personality.

SPEECH IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By MARDEL OGILVIE, Queens College. *McGraw-Hill Series in Speech*. 320 pages, \$4.50

This general method book suggests ways to promote effective oral communication in the elementary school classroom, emphasizes the relationship between speech activities and the language arts program, and indicates the part the teacher can play in improving the speaking habits of the elementary school child, alone and in conjunction with the school specialist. One of the outstanding features of the book is the inclusion of bibliographies of contemporary children's literature which may be used in developing the various speech activities.

TRAINING THE VOICE FOR SPEECH

By C. RAYMOND VAN DUSEN, University of Miami. *McGraw-Hill Series in Speech*. Second edition. 276 pages, \$4.25

Concise yet complete, this text presents a logically organized program of vocal training. The author discusses the physiological factors involved in vocalization, including recent advances in these fields as they relate to voice production. This book contains many exercises and practice selections for improving ability to produce vocal tones; to vary pitch, rate, and intensity; and to project the voice and speak clearly and distinctly. Considerable emphasis is placed on exercises for relaxation which promote easy vocalization.

Send for copies on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, Inc.

330 West 42nd Street

New York 36, N. Y.

